

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

10 REBECCA ALEXANDER, a single woman,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON, a county
14 municipality; STATE OF WASHINGTON,
15 one of the fifty states of the United States;
16 BANK OF AMERICA, N.A., a national
17 banking association; NORTHWEST
18 TRUSTEE SERVICES, INC., a Washington
19 corporation; U.S. BANK NATIONAL
20 ASSOCIATION, as Trustee for Harborview
21 Mortgage Loan Trust 2005-12, Mortgage Loan
22 Pass-through Certificates, Series 2005-12
Trust; NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC, a
foreign entity; JOHN DOE TRUSTEE; JOHN
DOE TRUST; MERS, a foreign corporation,

Defendants.

Case No. C17-653-RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF
ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION
FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES

23 This matter comes before the Court on a Motion for Reconsideration filed by Plaintiff
24 Rebecca Alexander. Dkt. #34. Plaintiff moves the Court to reconsider its Order granting in
25 part Plaintiff's Supplemental Motion for Attorney's Fees. *Id.* Plaintiff argues the Court's
26 conclusion that "[t]o bill 14 hours on a single task on a single day is incredible, *i.e.* not credible,
27 given the average attorney's need to eat, sleep, and take breaks from the intensity of legal
28

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER GRANTING IN PART
PLAINTIFF'S SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION FOR ATTORNEY'S FEES - 1

1 work,” Dkt. #32 at 5, is not “a credible legal conclusion supported by any evidence other than
2 the Court’s own views...” *Id.* at 2. Plaintiff lists as “facts” that “The Honorable Ricardo
3 Martinez denied Alexander’s request for attorney’s fees because he did not believe her
4 attorney, Scott E. Stafne (Stafne), worked the hours he claimed” and that “Judge Martinez
5 indicated that no attorneys work (or can work) over 14 hours a day.” *Id.* Plaintiff attaches
6 several declarations purporting to provide new evidence of Mr. Stafne’s work ethic. *See* Dkts.
7 #35–#39.
8

9 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” LCR 7(h)(1). “The court will ordinarily
10 deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a
11 showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention
12 earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.*
13

14 Plaintiff misconstrues the Court’s reasoning. The Court never indicated that it would be
15 impossible for an attorney to work over 14 hours a day. The issue was proper documentation.
16 After the above “incredible” quote, the following sentence was “[w]ithout a lengthier
17 description it is insufficient to meet Plaintiff’s burden to document the hours spent.” Dkt. #32
18 at 5. Plaintiff provided a threadbare, single billing entry to support what appeared to be a
19 straight 14 hour billing session. This was (and remains) insufficient documentation.
20

21 Although Plaintiff now provides further information about Mr. Stafne’s billing practices
22 via declarations, Plaintiff has failed to show why this new evidence “could not have been
23 brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). This
24 information could and should have been presented in the original Motion. However, to be
25 clear, this evidence would not have addressed the many other problems with Mr. Stafne’s
26 billing entries. As described in the Order, the 14-hour billing entry was duplicative and block-
27
28

1 billing, and the overall time spent was excessive. These are independent bases to strike Mr.
2 Stafne's billing entries that are unaddressed in this Motion for Reconsideration. Plaintiff has
3 failed to demonstrate manifest error. The Court will therefore deny this Motion.

4 Accordingly, having reviewed the relevant briefing, the declarations and exhibits
5 attached thereto, and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that
6 Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. #34) is DENIED.
7

8
9 DATED this 26 day of July, 2017.
10

11
12 

13 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
14 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28