

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

8 KEITH ADAIR DAVIS,

9 Plaintiffs,

10 v.

11 WILLIAM HAYES, et al.,

12 Defendants.

Case No. 2:16-cv-01709-RSM-BAT

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION**

13 On December 27, 2017, the Court denied plaintiff's motion to compel. Dkts. 76 and 98.

14 On January 5, 2018, plaintiff filed a "Response to Dkt. 98," in which he states again that the  
15 documents sent to him by defendants "are not responsive to his requests." Dkts. 101 and 102.

16 To the extent plaintiff is asking the Court to reconsider its Order (Dkt. 98), the request is denied.

17 The Court has reviewed its Order and plaintiff's motion and finds no reason to disturb its original  
18 ruling which was based, in part, on plaintiff's failure to demonstrate why the documents that  
19 have been produced to him by defendants are either incomplete or not responsive to his requests.

20 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored under the Court's local rules:

21 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will  
22 ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of  
23 manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal  
authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier  
with reasonable diligence.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

1 Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h)(1). Such motions are an “extraordinary remedy,” and “should  
2 not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with  
3 newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the  
4 controlling law.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)  
5 (internal citation omitted).

6 In this case plaintiff fails to show manifest error in the Court’s prior ruling, or new facts  
7 or legal authority that would warrant reconsideration of the Court’s order. Accordingly,  
8 plaintiff’s “response,” Dkt. 101 is **DENIED**.

9 DATED this 22nd day of January, 2018.

10 

11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA  
13 United States Magistrate Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23