

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ELLEN GRIFFIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE BOEING COMPANY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 13-38 RAJ

ORDER

On June 25, 2015, this Court entered an order granting summary judgment in favor of Defendant, the Boeing Company (“Boeing”). Dkt. ## 91, 92. Plaintiff appealed this order on July 15, 2015. Dkt. # 95. Two days after filing her notice of appeal, on July 18, 2015, she filed a motion for reconsideration of the underlying order dismissing her case. Dkt. # 96. She then filed an amended motion for reconsideration on July 21, 2015. Dkt. ## 98, 101. The Court denied her motion for reconsideration for several reasons: 1) Plaintiff had already filed an appeal with the Ninth Circuit, thereby divesting this Court of jurisdiction, 2) Plaintiff’s motion was filed after the deadline, and 3) upon

1 consideration of the merits the Court found that Plaintiff failed to meet her burden. Dkt.
2 # 104.

3 On June 15, 2016, Plaintiff filed a second motion for reconsideration. Dkt. # 110.
4 If her initial motion for reconsideration and amended motion for reconsideration were
5 procedurally defunct, then, even more so, is this one. To reiterate its last Order, the Court
6 notes that Plaintiff filed this current motion after having appealed to the Ninth Circuit,
7 and this motion was filed nearly a year after the Court's Order granting Boeing's motion
8 for summary judgment. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(2) ("The motion shall be
9 filed within fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed.").
10
11

12 However, even if this Court were to once more excuse the procedural defects, the
13 Court concludes that the motion for reconsideration is without merit. "Motions for
14 reconsideration are disfavored." LCR 7(h). "The court will ordinarily deny such motions
15 in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts
16 or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with
17 reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff's instant motion for reconsideration
18 neither demonstrates manifest legal error, nor does it direct the Court to new facts or legal
19 authority that she could not have presented previously in opposition to Boeing's motion.
20
21

22 There is nothing in Plaintiff's instant motion that persuades the court its prior decision
23 was incorrect. Accordingly, Plaintiff's second motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 110) is
24

25 **DENIED.**

26 //

27 //

Dated this 13th day of February, 2017.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Richard A. Jones". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a solid horizontal line.

The Honorable Richard A. Jones
United States District Judge

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27