

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

JOSEPH ANORUO,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.)
)
 VALLEY HEALTH SYSTEM, LLC,)
)
 Defendant.)
 _____)

Case No. 2:18-cv-00105-MMD-NJK
ORDER
(Docket Nos. 42, 44, 47)

Pending before the Court are Plaintiff Joseph Anoruo’s motion to stay discovery and renewed motion to stay discovery. Docket Nos. 42, 47. The Court has considered Plaintiff’s motions, Defendant’s responses, and Plaintiff’s reply. Docket Nos. 42, 43, 47, 50, 54. Also pending before the Court is Defendant’s countermotion for sanctions. Docket No. 44. Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendant’s motion. *See* Docket. The Court finds that the motions are properly resolved without a hearing. *See* Local Rule 78-1.

The instant motions are not the first time that Plaintiff has requested a stay of discovery in the instant case. Plaintiff previously requested a stay of discovery during the pendency of his motion to remand. Docket No. 26. The Court denied this request on April 13, 2018. Docket No. 35. Plaintiff’s current requests, for the same relief that the Court has already denied, are in essence requests for reconsideration of the Court’s prior order.¹

¹ The Court liberally construes the filings of *pro se* litigants. *Hebbe v. Pliler*, 627 F.3d 338, 342 n.7 (9th Cir. 2010).

1 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. Local Rule 59-1(b). Reconsideration is
2 appropriate if the Court: (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence; (2) committed clear
3 error, or the initial decision was manifestly unjust; or (3) if there is an intervening change in
4 controlling law. *Dixon v. Wallowa County*, 336 F.3d 1013, 1022 (9th Cir. 2003). Plaintiff's
5 motions do not cite, let alone attempt to comply with, the applicable standards. Reconsideration
6 is "an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly and in the interests of finality and conservation
7 of judicial resources." *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
8 (internal quotation marks omitted).

9 Accordingly,

10 **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motions, Docket Nos. 42 and 47, are **DENIED**. Both
11 parties shall diligently engage in discovery. The Court **WARNS** Plaintiff that failure to comply
12 with this order to diligently engage in discovery could result in sanctions, up to and including
13 dismissal of the instant case.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED THAT** Defendant's countermotion for sanctions, Docket
15 No. 44, is **DENIED**. The Court **WARNS** Plaintiff that he must respond to all motions filed in the
16 instant case, as failure to respond to a motion constitutes consent to the granting of the motion.
17 Local Rule 7-2(d).

18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 DATED: September 6, 2018.

20
21 
22 NANCY J. KOPPE
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE