

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

10 FRANCIS ANTHONY TREVINO,
11 et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 v.

14 KEVIN W. QUIGLEY, et al.,

15 Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-0487JLR

ORDER DENYING MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION

16 Before the court is *pro se* Plaintiffs Francis Anthony Trevino and Mark Newton
17 Kelly's (collectively, "Plaintiffs") motion for reconsideration of the court's May 8, 2018,
18 order dismissing Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants Spokane County Superior Court
19 Judge Gregory D. Sypolt; Spokane County Superior Court Judge James M. Murphy;
20 Washington State Supreme Court Clerk Erin L. Lennon; and Washington State Supreme
21 Court Clerk Susan L. Carlson (collectively, "Judicial Defendants"). (MFR (Dkt. # 7); *see*
22 *also* 5/8/18 Order (Dkt. # 6).) In that order, the court concluded that Plaintiffs had not

1 demonstrated the court's subject matter jurisdiction over Judicial Defendants because
2 those defendants enjoyed judicial immunity and quasi-judicial immunity. (*See* 5/8/18
3 Order at 1-2.) For the reasons set forth below, the court denies Plaintiffs' motion for
4 reconsideration.


5 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1), motions for reconsideration are disfavored,
6 and the court will ordinarily deny such motions unless the moving party shows (a)
7 manifest error in the prior ruling, or (b) new facts or legal authority that could not have
8 been brought to the attention of the court earlier through reasonable diligence. Local
9 Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1). Furthermore, a motion for reconsideration "shall be
10 filed within fourteen days after the order to which it relates is filed." *Id.* LCR 7(h)(2)
11 ("Failure to comply with this subsection may be grounds for denial of the motion.").

12 Plaintiffs do not meet any of the requirements for reconsideration of the court's
13 May 8, 2018, order. First, they bring their motion nearly a month after the order to which
14 it relates, and as such, the motion is untimely. (*See* MFR at 18 (showing a postmark of
15 June 5, 2018, and the court's receipt of the motion on June 11, 2018); 5/8/18 Order at 3);
16 Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(2). Second, they have not shown manifest error in
17 the court's prior ruling or new facts or legal authority that they could not have brought to
18 the court's attention earlier through reasonable diligence. *See* Local Rules W.D. Wash.
19 LCR 7(h)(1); (MFR at 1-16.) Indeed, Plaintiffs identify no purported error or new legal
20 authority. (*See id.*) And to the extent any of the legal authority they provide is newly
21 before the court, they do not explain why they could not have raised that authority earlier.

22 //

1 (See *id.*) For these reasons, the court DENIES Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration
2 (Dkt. # 7).

3 Dated this 15th day of June, 2018.

4
5 

6 JAMES L. ROBART
7 United States District Judge
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22