

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

4 Grant M. Saxena,

5 Plaintiff

6 v.

7 Jezrael Martinez-Hernandez, et al.,

8 Defendants
9

Case No. 2:22-cv-02126-CDS-BNW

**Order Denying Plaintiff's
Renewed Motion for Reconsideration**

[ECF No. 124]

10 Pending before the court is plaintiff Dr. Grant M. Saxena's renewed motion for
11 reconsideration. Mot., ECF No. 124. As noted in my prior order denying Saxena's prior motion
12 for reconsideration, reconsideration offers "an extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the
13 interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." *Carroll v. Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945
14 (9th Cir. 2003) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted), and it should not be granted
15 "absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly
16 discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling
17 law." *Id.* (quoting *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Est. of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 883 (9th Cir. 2000)). *See* Order,
18 ECF No. 123. Further, a mere disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis for
19 reconsideration. *See Leong v. Hilton Hotels Corp.*, 689 F. Supp. 1572, 1573 (D. Haw. 1988).
20 Disagreement with my prior order is entirely what Saxena presents as his argument in support
21 of his renewed reconsideration motion. Accordingly, he has failed to meet the high bar
22 demonstrating reconsideration is warranted.

23 I also note that there is once again evidence that Saxena's filing was made using
24 generative artificial intelligence. The opening line of his motion reads "Pursuant to Federal Rules
25 of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b), Plaintiff, Dr. [Your Full Name], respectfully moves this
26 Court to reconsider its orders denying recusal, sanctions, dismissal of the case with

1 prejudice . . .” ECF No. 124 at 1 (bracketed language in original). As already explained in my prior
2 orders, Saxena’s apparent penchant for using artificial intelligence to make up cases and case
3 quotations is unacceptable. *See* Order, ECF No. 98 at 8 (“I am left to assume one of two things:
4 either Saxena has fabricated cases and then lied to this court about their origin, or he enlisted
5 the assistance of artificial intelligence which invented fake cases to support his assertions, did
6 not check their validity, and then lied to this court about their origin. This behavior is entirely
7 unacceptable.”). He has shown no remorse, insisting that “the cases are not non-existent”
8 without providing proof of their existence and conceding only that “[t]he imperfect citations
9 and quotations could be attributed to a pro se lack of legal training and understanding, and
10 transcribing notes incorrectly[.]” ECF No. 100 at 10. As I explained in my order granting
11 defendants’ motion to dismiss, “although courts make ‘some allowances for [a] pro se Plaintiff’s
12 failure to cite to proper legal authority, courts do not make allowances for a Plaintiff who cites
13 to fake, nonexistent, misleading authorities,’ to include case terminating sanctions.” ECF No. 98
14 at 8 (quoting *Morgan v. Cmty. Against Violence*, 2023 WL 6976510, at *7 (D.N.M. Oct. 23, 2023)
15 (cleaned up)). However, this case has already concluded. *See id.* (granting defendants’ motion to
16 dismiss with prejudice). Saxena is cautioned that future filings, in this or any other court, may
17 result in sanctions, to include case terminating, monetary, or any other sanction the court deems
18 appropriate.

19 Conclusion

20 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Saxena’s renewed motion for reconsideration [ECF
21 No. 124] is DENIED.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no other documents may be filed in this now-closed
23 case.

24 Date: May 14, 2025

25 
26 Cristina D. Silva
United States District Judge