

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

BRENDA CONGDON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	CASE NO. C16-1629RSL
)	
v.)	
)	
WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A., <i>et al.</i> ,)	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO ALTER
)	OR AMEND JUDGMENT
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff’s “Notice of Motion and Motion to Alter or Amend the Judgment Pursuant to Rule 59(e).” Dkt. # 32. Having reviewed the memoranda submitted by the parties, the second proposed amended complaint, and the remainder of the record, the Court finds as follows:

Under Rule 59(e), reconsideration of the Court’s substantive rulings is warranted only if “(1) the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) the district court committed clear error or make an initial decision that was manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law.” United Nat. Ins. C. v. Spectrum Worldwide, Inc., 555 F.3d 772, 780 (9th Cir. 2009). The rule “may not be used to raise arguments . . . for the first

1 time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation.” Carroll v.
2 Nakatani, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003). Plaintiff’s arguments were either raised in her
3 motion to amend the complaint (and considered when the Court denied that motion) or
4 waived.

5 The motion to alter or amend judgment is hereby DENIED.

6
7 Dated this 24th day of August, 2017.

8 _____

9 Robert S. Lasnik
10 United States District Judge