UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

KELLI GRAY, and all others similarly situated,
 	
    Plaintiffs,
 	
    v.
 	
SUTTELL & ASSOCIATES, et al.,
 	
    Defendants.
_____
EVA LAUBER, et al.,
 	
    Plaintiffs,
 	
    v.
 	
ENCORE CAPITAL GROUP, INC., et al.,
 	
    Defendants.
	No. 2:09-cv-00251-SAB
	
	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, ECF NO. 614. The motion was heard without oral argument.

Generally, motions for reconsideration are disfavored. *See Carroll v. Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has instructed that Rule 59(e) is an "extraordinary remedy" that should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances. *Id.* Such circumstances include where the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law. *Id.* (quoting *Kona*

**ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ~** 1

Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)).

Plaintiffs have not demonstrated they are entitled to such extraordinary relief. They have not presented the Court with newly discovered evidence, shown that there is an intervening change in the controlling law, or convinced the Court that it committed clear error. More importantly, they did not challenge the Court's findings that permitting Plaintiffs to file a second amended complaint would substantially prejudice the Suttell Defendants.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**:

1. Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 614, is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter this Order and forward copies to counsel.

DATED this 15th day of December 2017.

Stanley A. Bastian
United States District Judge

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ~ 2