

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

KYM BARRON,

Plaintiff,

v.

COURTYARD MANAGEMENT
CORPORATION,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C17-1801 RSM

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION/MOTION
FOR RELIEF FROM DEADLINE

This matter comes before the Court on a “Praecipe” filed by Plaintiff Kym Barron on October 24, 2018. Dkt. #37. That filing states, in full, “[p]lease grant a continuance to allow me time to secure legal counsel to represent me in this matter.” *Id.* The Court interprets this filing as either a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s recent Order granting Defendant’s Motion to Compel (Dkt. #36) or a motion for a relief from the deadline set in that Order. The Court has determined that response briefing is unnecessary. See LCR 7(h)(3).

“Motions for reconsideration are disfavored.” LCR 7(h)(1). “The court will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a

1 showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention
2 earlier with reasonable diligence.” *Id.*

3 The Court finds that Ms. Barron has failed to set forth good cause to grant a
4 continuance or otherwise modify the Court’s prior Order setting a seven-day deadline for her to
5 comply with Defendant’s discovery requests. Dkt. #36. Ms. Barron identifies no error in the
6 Court’s prior Order. That Order was based on Defendant’s Motion detailing their efforts to
7 work with Ms. Barron to get needed discovery in this case, including seeking an extension of
8 the discovery deadline.

9 On July 31, 2018, the Court permitted Ms. Barron’s former counsel to withdraw. Dkt.
10 #26. At that point Ms. Barron could have chosen to proceed pro se in this matter, or to seek
11 new counsel. However, her lack of counsel three months later, alone, is insufficient to justify
12 further noncompliance with valid discovery requests.

13 Having reviewed the relevant briefing and the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
14 finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. #37) is DENIED. The
15 current deadline remain in place. The Court urges the parties to resolve this discovery dispute,
16 to the extent possible, without resorting to further Court action.

17 DATED this 25th day of October 2018.

18
19 

20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
21 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24