

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BRETT DIFFLEY,)	
)	CASE NO. C17-1370 RSM
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
v.)	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
)	
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE LLC,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt. #33. Plaintiff asserts that the Court committed manifest error in its prior Order dismissing his Amended Complaint in part when the Court found that Plaintiff’s failure to meet his debt obligations was the “but for” cause of the default, and in dismissing his negligence claim against Defendant Nationstar. *Id.*

“Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” LCR 7(h). “The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of 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.” LCR 7(h)(1). In this case, the Court is not persuaded that it should reconsider its prior Order. In his current motion, Plaintiff essentially reiterates arguments raised in opposition to the motion to dismiss. The Court considered those arguments and rejected them. Moreover, nothing presented by Plaintiff in the instant motion persuades the Court that it made any error in reaching its prior decision. Likewise, Plaintiff fails to show new facts or legal

ORDER
PAGE - 1

1 authority which could not have been brought to the Court's attention earlier with reasonable
2 diligence, particularly because this was the second time Plaintiff was faced with a motion to
3 dismiss. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. #33) is DENIED.

4 DATED this 27th day of April 2018.

5
6 

7 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
8 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28