1		
1		
2		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA	
8	RICHARD DEEDS,	
9	Plaintiff,	
10	v.	3:14-cv-138-RCJ-WGC
11	ROMEO ARANAS et al.,	ORDER
12	Defendants.	
13		
14	I. DISCUSSION	
15	On April 28, 2014, this Court issued a screening order which dismissed Counts I and I	
16	(deliberate indifference and due process) with prejudice and permitted Count III (disciplinary	
17	due process) to proceed. (ECF No. 7 at 7). This case entered a 90-day stay for the purpose	
18	of informal settlement discussions. (ECF No. 7, 10).	
19	On May 7, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 11). Plaintif	
20	argues that Counts I and II should proceed and that, in Count III, the Court should further order	
21	that Plaintiff had a "liberty interest in not being charged with misconduct in the first place." (Id	
22	at 1, 9).	
23	A motion to reconsider must set forth "some valid reason why the court should	
24	reconsider its prior decision" and set "forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to	
25	persuade the court to reverse its prior decision." Frasure v. United States, 256 F.Supp.20	
26	1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2003). Reconsideration is appropriate if this Court "(1) is presented with	
27	newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly	
28	unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Sch. Dist. No. 1J v. Acand	
	Inc. 5 F 3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993) "A r	notion for reconsideration is not an avenue to

Deeds v. Aranas et al

Doc. 13

re-litigate the same issues and arguments upon which the court already has ruled." *Brown v. Kinross Gold, U.S.A.*, 378 F.Supp.2d 1280, 1288 (D. Nev. 2005).

The Court has read Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration and finds that Plaintiff reiterates the factual allegations he presented in his complaint. The Court does not find that it committed clear error in its initial screening order or that its order was manifestly unjust. As such, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration.

II. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 11) is DENIED.

DATED: This 28th day of May, 2014.

United States District Judge