In man w	E aile	tion of
Jones v.	Fair	lieid

Fair	field Case 2:20-cv-00475-SAB ECF No. 34 file	FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
2	Mar 23, 2021			
3	SEAN F. MCAVOY, CLERK			
4				
5				
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON			
8				
9	In rematter of ICJ, an infant under the age	No. 2:20-CV-00475-SAB		
10	of 16,			
11	KERRY JONES,			
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION		
13	V.	FOR RECONSIDERATION		
14	CASSANDRA FAIRFIELD,			
15	Respondent.			
16				
17	Before the Court is Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration Pursuant to			
18	FRCP 60(b), ECF No. 25. Petitioner Jones ("Jones") is represented by Robert			
19	Michaels and Grant Courtney. Respondent Cassandra Fairfield ("Fairfield") is			
20	represented by Kenneth Zigler and Joanna Puryear. The Court has determined that			
21	oral argument is not warranted. See LR 7.1(i)(3)(B)(iii).			
22	On January 17, 2021, the Court denied Jones' Verified Petition for the			
23	Return of A Child Pursuant to the Hague Convention and ICARA. ECF No. 23. On			
24	February 19, 2021, Jones filed his Motion for Reconsideration, asking the Court to			
25	reconsider its ruling that Jones was not exercising his custody rights because			
26	Fairfield and their child were living in a homeless shelter as she did not have the			
27	funds to pay for other lodging, therefore because he was not exercising his			
28	custodial rights at the time of the retention, the retention and removal of the child			
	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR R	ECONSIDERATION~1		

to the United States was not wrongful; and to reconsider its ruling that if the child
were ordered to be returned to France there is a grave risk the return would place
the child in an intolerable situation.

## **Motion Standard**

Jones is bringing this motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(1), (3), and (6).
Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), courts may only reconsider a final order on certain
enumerated grounds. These grounds include:

(1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect;

9

10

11

25

8

(3) fraud... misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; or

(6) any other reason justifying relief from the operation of the judgment.

Rule 60(b)(6) is a "catchall provision" that applies when a party gives a
reason for granting relief from a final judgment or order that is not covered by any
of the other reasons set forth in Rule 60(b). Rule 60(b)(6) has been used sparingly
as an equitable remedy to prevent manifest injustice and only where extraordinary
circumstances prevented a party from taking timely action to prevent or correct an
erroneous judgment. *United States v. Alpine Land & Reservoir Co.*, 984 F.2d 1047,
1049 (9th Cir. 1993). To prevail, a party who moves for such relief must
demonstrate both injury and circumstances beyond his control that prevented him
from proceeding with the action in a proper fashion. *Cmty. Dental Servs. v. Tani*,
282 F.3d 1164, 1168 (9th Cir. 2002).

A Rule 60(b) motion is not an avenue to relitigate the same issues and
arguments upon which the Court already has ruled. *See Maraziti v. Thorp*, 52 F.3d
252, 255 (9th Cir. 1995).

Analysis

In his motion, Jones presents the same evidence the Court already
considered when it denied his Petition. He has not shown that a mistake,
inadvertence, surprise, or excusable neglect has occurred, has not shown that

## **ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**~2

Fairfield engaged in fraud, misrepresentation, or misconduct, and has not
convinced the Court that it erred in its findings of fact and conclusions of law. To
the extent it was not clear in its order, the Court finds by clear and convincing
evidence that if the child were ordered to be returned to France there is a grave risk
that the return would place the child in an intolerable situation, given that Jones has
attempted suicide, threatened to blackmail Fairfield, cut off her and their child's
financial support, and he viewed child pornography in the presence of their child.

## Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**:

9 1. Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration Pursuant to FRCP 60(b), ECF
10 No. 25, is **DENIED**.

11 IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk of Court is directed to enter this Order
12 and forward copies to counsel and close the file.

**DATED** this 23rd day of March 2021.

Stanley A. Bastian Chief United States District Judge

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION~3