

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

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

9 SING CHO NG,

CASE NO. C18-0690-JCC

10 Plaintiff,

ORDER

11 v.

12 JIM METZ, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

14
15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No.
16 12). Having thoroughly considered Plaintiffs' briefing and the relevant record, the Court
17 DENIES the motion for the reasons explained herein.

18 Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored. W.D. Wash. Local Civ. R. 7(h)(1).
19 Reconsideration is only appropriate where there is "manifest error in the prior ruling or a
20 showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's]
21 attention earlier with reasonable diligence." *Id.* "A motion for reconsideration should not be
22 used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or
23 wrongly." *Premier Harvest LLC v. AXIS Surplus Insurance Co.*, No. C17-0784-JCC, Dkt. No.
24 61 at 1 (W.D. Wash. 2017) (quoting *U.S. v. Rezzonico*, 32 F. Supp. 2d 1112, 1116 (D. Ariz.
25 1998)).

26 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1915(e)(2)(B), the Court dismissed Plaintiff's complaint

ORDER
C18-0690-JCC
PAGE - 1

1 without leave to amend. (Dkt. No. 10 at 7.) The claims against Defendants Janet Helson and
2 Kirstin Grant were dismissed with prejudice because the Court concluded their actions were
3 protected by judicial immunity. (*Id.* at 3–4.)

4 Plaintiff requests that the Court reconsider its dismissal with prejudice of Helson and
5 Grant. (Dkt. No. 12 at 1.) In support of this request, Plaintiff asks the Court to “re-scrutinize my
6 pleadings in my amended complaint.” (*Id.*) Plaintiff goes on to list numerous sections from his
7 amended complaint, apparently to show that Helson and Grant are liable for the conduct he
8 alleges. (*See generally id.*)

9 Plaintiff neither demonstrates that the Court committed manifest error nor provides new
10 facts or legal authority that would change the Court’s ruling. Instead, Plaintiff asks the Court to
11 “rethink what [it] had already thought through.” No. C17-0784-JCC, Dkt. No. 61 at 1. For these
12 reasons, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 12) is DENIED.

13 DATED this 25th day of July 2018.

14
15
16 

17 John C. Coughenour
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26