

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

10
11 ARTHUR WEST,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 WEYERHAEUSER, et al.,

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. C08-687RSM

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

16
17 Plaintiff has moved for reconsideration of the Court's April 8, 2009 Order of Dismissal (Dkt. #
18 48), as well as "all previous rulings in this case."¹ Such motions are disfavored and will be denied in the
19 absence of "a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority
20 which could not have been brought to its attention earlier. . . ." Local Rule CR 7(h)(1). The Court
21 deems it unnecessary to direct defendants to respond to the motion.

22 Plaintiff's motion simply amounts to re-argument of issues already considered and decided. His
23 argument and exhibits, comprising more than a hundred pages, fail to present any relevant facts that could
24 not have been presented earlier; nor do they compel any change in the result even if they were considered.

25 The Court's prior ruling was based on a determination that plaintiff West had not presented any

26
27 ¹As to any ruling other than the Order of Dismissal, the motion for reconsideration is untimely.
Local Rule CR 7(h)(2).

1 medical evidence to substantiate his claim that a severe disability prevented him from prosecuting this
2 case. The additional evidence submitted by plaintiff consists of an undated, unauthenticated photograph
3 of a swollen left hand, together with a copy of a statement from the Department of Labor and Industries,
4 dated October 30, 2008, indicating that plaintiff West was allowed benefits in an undetermined amount
5 "for a crime that occurred on 10/10/08". Dkt. # 50, p. 13. This document may provide support for
6 plaintiff West's claim that his hand was injured in an altercation that occurred on October 10, 2008. The
7 injury to plaintiff's hand has not been questioned by the Court. However, at no time in either his prior
8 filings or the current filings, has plaintiff West presented actual medical documentation that the injury to
9 his left had was so severe as to completely prevent him from prosecuting this case. It was on that basis
10 that the case was dismissed.

11 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is accordingly DENIED, for failure to meet the standard set
12 forth in Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

13 Dated this 4 day of May, 2009.

14 

15 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE