FILED IN THE 1 U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 2 Sep 17, 2021 SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 3 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 4 GILBERTO GOMEZ GARCIA, as an No. 2:20-cv-00254-SMJ individual and on behalf of all other 5 similarly situated persons, JONATHAN GOMEZ RIVERA, as an ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' individual and on behalf of all other **MOTION FOR** similarly situated persons, RECONSIDERATION 7 Plaintiffs, 8 9 v. STEMILT AG SERVICES LLC, 10 Defendant. 11 12 Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion for Reconsideration of 13 Court Order ECF No. 87, ECF No. 173. The Court denies the motion. 14 Reconsideration is an "extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the 15 interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." Kona Enterprises, Inc. 16 v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000). "A district court may 17 properly reconsider its decision if it '(1) is presented with newly discovered 18 evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or 19 (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Smith v. Clark Cnty. Sch. 20 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION – 1

Garcia et al v.

Stemilt Ag Services LLC

Doc. 198

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
_	0

Dist., 727 F.3d 950, 955 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting Sch. Dist. No. 1J, 5 F.3d at 1263). Courts generally disfavor motions for reconsideration, and they may not be used to present new arguments or evidence that could have been raised earlier. Fuller v. M.G. Jewelry, 950 F.2d 1437, 1442 (9th Cir.1991).

The Court cannot determine that it has committed clear error or that its initial decision was manifestly unjust. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- Plaintiffs' Rule 54(b) Motion for Reconsideration of Court Order ECF 1. No. 87, ECF No. 173, is DENIED.
 - However, the Court **AMENDS** the Order at Page 11, Line 11– A. 13 to read "And there is no public right to access unfiled discovery. See Bond v. Ulteras, 585 F.3d 1061 (7th Cir. 2009)."
 - В. The Court notes that nothing in the Court's Order, ECF No. 87, prevents Plaintiffs from requesting initial ex parte or in camera review of any request under the Order, as appropriate.

IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and provide copies to all counsel.

DATED this 17th day of September 2021.

SALVADOR MENDOZA,

United States District Judge