

Honorable Ronald B. Leighton

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

EVANSTON INSURANCE COMPANY, an )	
Illinois corporation, )	No. 3:10-cv-05625-RBL
)	
Plaintiffs, )	ORDER REQUESTING RESPONSE TO
)	MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
v. )	
)	
COUNTY OF CLARK, a Washington State )	
municipal corporation, WEXFORD HEALTH )	
SOURCES, INC., a foreign corporation; PHI )	
THI NGUYEN, individually and VY VIET )	
TRAN, individually and in his capacity )	
As Personal Representative of the Estate of )	
VUONG QUANG TRAN, deceased; GARRY )	
E. LUCAS, JOSEPH K. DUNEGAN, JACKIE )	
BATTIES, BILL BARRON, JACK G. HUFF, )	
MICHAEL J. NAGY, ROBERT KARCHER, )	
DANIEL L. CONN, NICKOLAS A. LITTLE, )	
CAROL L. RANCE, KELLY E. EPPERSON, )	
GLADYS C. MAYNARD, REGINALD D. )	
LEWIS, DANIEL J. GORECKI, RITA A. )	
LAURENT, SUSAN M. BANKSTON, )	
)	
Defendants. )	

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff Evanston’s Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt. #47] of the Court’s Order [Dkt. #46] on Evanston’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Dkt. #39].


1 Evanston argues that Clark County was an additional insured under the policy Evanston  
2 issued to Wexford “only as respects liability for Bodily Injury or Property Damage caused by the  
3 negligence of the Named Insured.” It argues that the Court’s Order left open the possibility of  
4 coverage only for claims against the city arising from general administrative policies, which do  
5 not on their face allege liability for bodily injury caused by the negligence of the Named Insured.

6 Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such  
7 motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error or a showing of new facts or authority  
8 which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence. CR 7(h)(1),  
9 Local Rules W.D. Wash. No motion for reconsideration will be granted unless an opposing  
10 party has been afforded the opportunity to file a response. CR 7(h).

11 The Court hereby REQUESTS that the City respond to Evanston’s Motion on the above  
12 issue and argument. The Response should be no more than 5 pages and should be filed within 5  
13 days of the date of this Order.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2011.

16  
17 

18 RONALD B. LEIGHTON  
19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26