

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
5 AT TACOMA

6 OSSIE LEE SLAUGHTER,

7 Petitioner,

8 v.

9 DANIEL WHITE,

10 Respondent.

Case No. 2:21-1421-JLR-TLF

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

11 This matter comes before the Court on petitioner's motion for reconsideration.
12 Dkt. 23. For the reasons set forth herein, petitioner's motion for reconsideration is
13 DENIED.

14 FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

15 Petitioner filed a motion requesting appointment of counsel. Dkt. 18. Petitioner's
16 motion requested appointment of counsel because he had been transferred to a
17 different correctional facility and did not have access to a law library. Dkt. 18. Petitioner
18 stated that the nearest available law library was in a facility that was under a quarantine
19 due to a COVID 19 outbreak. Dkt. 18. The Court denied petitioner's motion for
20 appointment of counsel without prejudice and granted petitioner an extension of time to
21 file a reply brief. Dkt. 20.

22 Petitioner has filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order Denying
23 Appointment of Counsel. Dkt. 23. Petitioner's motion argues that he is still being denied
24
25

1 adequate access to the law library because the law library in his housing assignment
2 has limited hours. Dkt. 23. Petitioner states that due to the limited hours he is only able
3 to research a limited number of cases. Dkt. 23. Petitioner's motion for reconsideration
4 also argues – for the first time – that the Court should hold an evidentiary hearing and
5 appoint counsel for the evidentiary hearing. Dkt. 23.

6 DISCUSSION

7 Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored under the Court's local
8 rules:

9 Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny
10 such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior
11 ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have
12 been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.

13 Local Rules W.D. Wash. CR 7(h)(1). Such motions are an “extraordinary remedy,” and
14 “should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is
15 presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an
16 intervening change in the controlling law.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v. Estate of Bishop*, 229
17 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000) (internal citations omitted).

18 The Court declines to consider petitioner's request that the Court order an
19 evidentiary hearing and appoint counsel for the evidentiary hearing. Petitioner argues
20 that the Court should hold an evidentiary hearing to determine whether -- based on the
21 record before the state courts -- the state courts erred by unreasonably applying clearly
22 established federal law. Dkt. 23. Petitioner raises this argument for the first time in the
23 motion for reconsideration. New evidence, facts or legal authority can only be
24 considered on a motion for reconsideration if the information could not have been
25

1 brought to the Court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence. Local Rules W.D.
2 Wash. CR 7(h)(1). Petitioner could have raised this issue in the previous motion for
3 appointment of counsel, or the initial petition. Petitioner's request for an evidentiary
4 hearing is not properly before the Court on petitioner's motion for reconsideration.

5 The Court may request an attorney to represent an indigent litigant under 28
6 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) but should do so only under "exceptional circumstances." *Agyeman*
7 *v. Corrections Corp. of Am.*, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004). "A finding of
8 exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on
9 the merits and the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims pro se in light of the
10 complexity of the legal issues involved. *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331
11 (9th Cir. 1986). These factors must be viewed together before reaching a decision on a
12 request for counsel under § 1915(e)(1). *Id.*

13 The Court previously determined that this matter does not present exceptional
14 circumstances supporting appointment of counsel. Dkt. 20. Petitioner has not provided
15 any new arguments, legal authority or evidence indicating that petitioner is unable to
16 effectively articulate his grounds for relief in the petition or otherwise present his claims
17 in this action.

18 Additionally, petitioner's previous motion stated that due to a COVID-19 outbreak
19 he could not access a law library. Dkt. 19. The Court explained that petitioner's
20 argument regarding lack of access to a law library could be addressed by petitioner's
21 motion for extension of time. Dkt. 20. Petitioner's motion for reconsideration states that
22 now petitioner does have access to the law library but is only allowed a limited time to
23
24
25

1 research case law. Dkt. 23. Petitioner's concern regarding limited access to the law
2 library can be addressed with a motion for extension of time.

3 CONCLUSION

4 Based on the foregoing discussion, petitioner's motion for reconsideration (Dkt.
5 23) is DENIED.

6 Dated this 6th day of May, 2022.

7
8 

9

Theresa L. Fricke
10 United States Magistrate Judge