

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
DUPLICATIVE MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

13 Presently before the Court is the motion for summary judgment of Defendants Bliss,
14 Elerick, Gorman, and McKindry. Dkt. 81. Defendants contend dismissal of Mr. Davis' claims is
15 appropriate because he has failed to exhaust his administrative remedies and because they are
16 entitled to qualified immunity. *Id.* Mr. Davis requested and was granted two extensions to
17 respond to the motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 104 and Dkt. 113.

18 Despite the extensions granted to him, Mr. Davis has filed no substantive response to the
19 pending motion for summary judgment. Instead, on March 2, 2018, he filed a third motion based
20 on his claim that he has been denied sufficient discovery. Dkt. 114. He seeks to "deny or stay"
21 the motion for summary judgment based on his repeated argument that defendants failed to
22 provide him with discovery responsive to his requests. This argument has previously been
23 addressed by the Court and denied. *See* Dkt. 98 (Order denying motion to compel (Dkt. 76));

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S DUPLICATIVE MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION - 1

1 Dkt. 108 (Order denying motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 101)).

2 The Court has reviewed its Order and plaintiff's motion and finds no reason to disturb its
3 original ruling which was based, in part, on plaintiff's failure to demonstrate why the documents
4 that have been produced to him by defendants (including documents relating to his grievances)
5 are either incomplete or not responsive to his requests. As plaintiff was previously advised,
6 motions for reconsideration are disfavored (Local Rules W. D. Wash. CR 7(h)(1)), and he has
7 failed to show manifest error in the Court's prior ruling, or new facts or legal authority that
8 would warrant reconsideration of the Court's order.

9 Accordingly, plaintiff's "motion to deny or stay" (Dkt. 114) is **DENIED**. Defendants'
10 motion for summary judgment (Dkt. 81) is currently noted on the Court's docket for March 9,
11 2018. The Court will consider the motion at that time and will grant no further extensions. Dkt.
12 113.

13 DATED this 5th day of March, 2018.

14 

15 _____
16 BRIAN A. TSUCHIDA
17 United States Magistrate Judge
18
19
20
21
22
23