

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 DONALD ROT SIN BARREN,

Case No.: 2:19-cv-00142-APG-VCF

4 Plaintiff

**Order Denying Motion for Reconsideration**

5 v.

[ECF No. 56]

6 JAMES DZURENDA, et al.,

7 Defendants

8 Plaintiff Donald Barren moves for reconsideration of my prior order dismissing various  
9 defendants because of Barren’s failure to timely serve them.

10 Reconsideration may be appropriate “if the district court (1) is presented with newly  
11 discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or  
12 (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law.” *Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d  
13 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). A district court may also reconsider its decision if “other, highly  
14 unusual, circumstances” warrant it. *Id.* As the movant, Barren “must set forth facts or law of a  
15 strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision.” *United States v.*  
16 *Westlands Water Dist.*, 134 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1131 (E.D. Cal. 2001). A motion for  
17 reconsideration “must not repeat arguments already presented unless (and only to the extent)  
18 necessary to explain controlling, intervening law or to argue new facts.” LR 59-1(b); *Backlund v.*  
19 *Barnhart*, 778 F.2d 1386, 1388 (9th Cir. 1985).

20 Barren has not presented sufficient evidence or reasons for me to reconsider my prior  
21 order.

22 ////

23 ////

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

I THEREFORE ORDER that plaintiff Donald Barren’s motion for reconsideration (**ECF No. 56**) is denied.

DATED this 11th day of January, 2022.



---

ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE