

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

10 THE HANOVER INSURANCE
11 COMPANY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 INTREPID LAW GROUP, LLC, et
15 al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-0662JLR

ORDER DENYING
DEFENDANTS
TAKENAKA/ROUNDS'S
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

16 Before the court is Defendants Tracy Takenaka and Brian Rounds's (collectively,
17 "Takenaka/Rounds") motion for reconsideration of the court's May 18, 2021 order
18 granting in part Plaintiff The Hanover Insurance Company's ("Hanover") motion for
19 reconsideration of the court's March 18, 2021 order denying Hanover's motion for
20 summary judgment. (*See* MFR (Dkt. # 63); *see also* 5/18/21 Order (Dkt. # 61); 3/18/21
21 Order (Dkt. # 53).) Motions for reconsideration are disfavored, and the court ordinarily
22 will deny such motions unless the moving party shows (a) manifest error in the prior

1 ruling, or (b) new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the attention
2 of the court earlier through reasonable diligence. Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1).

3 The court has carefully reviewed Takenaka/Rounds’s motion. Takenaka/Rounds
4 present no new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the court’s
5 attention earlier with reasonable diligence. (*See generally* MFR.) Instead, they now
6 argue that the claims they brought in state court against Defendants Intrepid Law Group,
7 LLC (“Intrepid”) and Thi Huynh are not subject to the “Outside Entities” exclusion in the
8 professional liability insurance policy at issue in this case because the claims (1) neither
9 “arise” nor “originate” from Mr. Huynh’s control or management of Green Sky
10 Productions, LLC (“Green Sky”) and Defendant 4200 Letitia, LLC (“Letitia”) and (2) are
11 not “in any way related to” Green Sky or Letitia. (*See generally id.*) Takenaka/Rounds
12 do not explain why they could not have raised the legal authority they cite in their motion
13 in their response to Hanover’s motion for reconsideration. (*See generally id.*; *see also*
14 4/2/21 Order (Dkt. # 55) (directing Defendants to file a response limited to the
15 applicability of the “Outside Entities” exclusion); Takenaka/Rounds Resp. (Dkt. # 56).)
16 Moreover, the court’s May 18, 2021 order fully analyzed the applicability of the “Outside
17 Entities” exclusion to Takenaka/Rounds’s claims. (*See* 5/18/21 Order at 11-15.)

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22

1 For the foregoing reasons, the court concludes that Takenaka/Rounds have made
2 neither of the required Local Rule LCR 7(h)(1) showings. (*See generally* MFR.)
3 Therefore, the court DENIES Takenaka/Rounds's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 63).

4 Dated this 2nd day of June, 2021.

5
6 

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