


1 of that video and the failure to turn over video of the incident as a “fraud” on the court.⁶ In the
2 second, he argues that the respondents’ failure to oppose that motion constitutes their consent to
3 grant it.⁷ As the defendants point out in their opposition to Bell’s first motion, his video-
4 evidence argument is a regurgitation of his earlier points, which have been repeatedly rejected by
5 this court and now the Ninth Circuit.⁸ And although Local Rule 7-2 permits the court to deem a
6 party’s failure to respond to a motion as their consent to grant it, the defendants *did* respond to
7 Bell’s motion,⁹ so Rule 7-2 does not apply here. Because Bell has provided no valid basis for
8 relief from this final judgment that has been affirmed on appeal, I deny his motions.

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Bell’s Motion for Leave to Reopen Case to File
10 Motion Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(3) and 60(d)(3), and his Motion for a Court
11 Order to Grant Motion for Leave to Reopen Case to File Motion under Fed. R. Civ. P 60(b)(3)
12 and (d)(3) [ECF Nos. 106, 113] are DENIED.

13
14 
15 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
16 January 4, 2022
17
18
19
20

21 ⁶ ECF No. 106 at 2–4.

22 ⁷ ECF No. 113 at 2.

23 ⁸ ECF No. 111 (defendants’ response to motion for leave to reopen case to file motion under
FRCP 60(b)(3)).

⁹ *See id.*