

1 since the thrust of SFR’s response is that the accuracy of such documentation is the subject of reasonable
2 questioning. *Compare id.* (noting standard for judicial notice) *with* Docket No. 93 at 3-5 (noting
3 potential for inaccuracy). With respect to the newly identified discretionary factors, Plaintiff provides
4 no explanation as to why such discussion was not provided in its motion. The Court declines to consider
5 arguments that were raised in reply for the first time. *See, e.g., Bazuaye v. I.N.S.*, 79 F.3d 118, 120 (9th
6 Cir. 1996).

7 Accordingly, the motion to substitute is hereby **DENIED** without prejudice. Any renewed
8 motion must provide meaningfully developed argument showing (1) that a transfer of interest has been
9 established through the motion and any exhibits thereto, and (2) that the Court should exercise its
10 discretion to afford the relief sought.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: November 8, 2017

13 
14 _____
15 NANCY J. KOPPE
16 United States Magistrate Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28