

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ADRIAN FULLER, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs,
v.
JEH JOHNSON,
Defendant.

Case No. C14-208RSL

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on “Plaintiff’s (sic) Motion for Reconsideration for Appointment of Counsel.” Dkt. # 8. On March 6, 2014, the Court denied Plaintiffs’ motion for the appointment of counsel because Plaintiffs did not demonstrate diligence in seeking counsel and their claims are of dubious merit. *Id.* at 2-3. Plaintiffs disagree with the Court’s findings and have submitted additional evidence in support of their request for reconsideration. Dkt. # 8.

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored in this district and will be granted only upon a “showing of manifest error in the prior ruling” or “new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiffs have not met this burden. Contrary to Plaintiffs’ contention, the Court considered that Plaintiffs’ former attorney stopped representing them just before they filed the above-captioned case. Dkt. # 4 at 2. Plaintiffs, however, failed to submit any evidence from which the Court could find that

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION - 1

1 they had made a single attempt to obtain counsel since that date. Id. Plaintiffs have not
2 demonstrated that this finding was manifest error. In addition, Plaintiffs have not
3 argued that the evidence submitted could not have been presented to the Court earlier.
4 Even if the Court were to consider the list of attorneys and law firms attached to their
5 motion for reconsideration, Plaintiffs still fail to demonstrate that they have made any
6 meaningful attempts to obtain counsel since their lawyer stopped representing them in
7 February. The general list of law firms and attorneys provides no insight into the nature
8 or timing of Plaintiffs' efforts. Dkt. # 8-6.

9 With respect to the Court's finding that Plaintiffs' claims are of dubious legal
10 merit, Plaintiffs simply disagree. They argue generally that Title VII claims have merit,
11 but that is insufficient for reconsideration. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have not shown
12 manifest error in the Court's finding that their claims are likely barred by res judicata.
13 Despite Plaintiffs' arguments to the contrary, the Equal Employment Opportunity
14 Commission's decision attached to their motion for reconsideration affirmed an earlier
15 agency decision dismissing Plaintiffs' complaint because it was untimely. Dkt. # 8-5.
16 In sum, Defendants have not shown manifest error or the existence of new facts or legal
17 authority that could not have been brought to the Court's attention with reasonable
18 diligence.

19 For all of the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 8)
20 is DENIED.

21 DATED this 25th day of March, 2014.

22 

23 Robert S. Lasnik
24 United States District Judge