

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

8  
9 INTEGRITY TRUST, by its trustee, Jon  
Cuddeback,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CAPITAL ONE, N.A., *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

Case No. C16-927RSL

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION OF  
SANCTIONS

14  
15 This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of  
16 Sanctions for Attorney Fees and Costs." Dkt. # 44. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored  
17 in this district and will be granted only upon a "showing of manifest error in the prior ruling" or  
18 "new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier  
19 with reasonable diligence." LCR 7(h)(1). Plaintiff has shown neither. Moreover, in objecting  
20 to the sanctions ordered by the Court, see Dkt. # 41, plaintiff argues that defendants inflated their  
21 litigation costs by failing to move for dismissal of a case that plaintiff filed but "never  
22 commenced against any defendant." Dkt. # 44. Of course, defendants did move to dismiss this  
23 case. Dkt. # 15. Plaintiff's opposition to that motion to dismiss, Dkt. # 19, and eventual appeal  
24 of the Court's order granting that motion to dismiss, Dkt. # 35, belie plaintiff's assertion that  
25 anyone but plaintiff is to blame for extending the life of this frivolous lawsuit.

26  
27  
28 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION - 1

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  
28

For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 44) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this 19th day of May, 2017.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert S. Lasnik  
United States District Judge