

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

8 G.O. AMERICA SHIPPING COMPANY,
9 INC., a corporation registered in the Republic
10 of the Marshall Islands,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13
14 CHINA COSCO SHIPPING
15 CORPORATION LIMITED, a company
16 registered in the People Republic of China;
17 COSCO SHIPPING LINES CO, Ltd. a
18 subsidiary of CHINA COSCO SHIPPING
19 CORPORATION LIMITED; CHINA
20 SHIPPING INDUSTRY, (Shanghai
21 Changxing) Co. Ltd., a subsidiary of CHINA
22 COSCO SHIPPING CORPORATION
23 LIMITED,

24 Defendants.

Case No. C17-0912 RSM

ORDER DENYING SPECIAL
CLAIMANT’S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

24 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Specially-Appearing Claimant COSCO
25 Atlantic Shipping Ltd.’s (hereinafter “COSCO Atlantic”) Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. #55.
26 Although it was successful on its prior Motion to Vacate Rule B Attachment, it now asks the
27
28

1 Court to amend its Order granting that motion to include a legal standard that the Court did not
2 discuss. *Id.*

3 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” LCR 7(h). “The court will ordinarily deny
4 such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of
5 new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with
6 reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1). In this case, the Court is not persuaded that it is necessary
7 to amend its Order. Special Claimant complains that the Court did not state the complete standard
8 required to prevail on a Rule E(4)(f) hearing. Specifically, Special Claimant notes that the Court
9 should have set forth a probable cause standard, particularly because Plaintiff conceded that was
10 the correct standard. Special Claimant misconstrues the Court’s Order. The Court’s written
11 Order was meant to supplement the oral ruling provided on the record on July 10, 2017. *See* Dkt.
12 #47. During that hearing, the Court noted, and Plaintiff conceded, that Plaintiff had the burden
13 of showing probable cause for the vessel arrest. While the Court did not discuss that standard
14 again in the written Order, it does not mean that the Court disposed of or denied that burden in
15 any way. Rather, the Court focused on a different reason to grant the motion. Accordingly, the
16 Court finds it unnecessary to amend its written Order. Accordingly, Special Claimant’s Motion
17 for Reconsideration (Dkt. #55) is DENIED.
18
19
20

21 DATED this 3rd day of August 2017.
22

23 

24 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
25 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
26
27
28