| 1 | | HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON |
|----------------|---|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA | |
| 8 | TODD FOSTER, et al., | |
| 9 10 | Plaintiffs, | No.11-05171-RBL |
| 11 | V. | |
| 12 | STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al., | ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION |
| 13 | Defendants. | [Dkt. #19]. |
| 14 15 16 | This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt. #19]. The Court has reviewed and considered the Motion. | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | Under Local Rule 7, Motions for Reconsideration are disfavored, and will ordinarily be | |
| 19 | denied absent a showing of manifest error, or a new factual or legal basis which could not have | |
| 20 | been raised earlier. Local Rule 7(h). | |
| 21 | Plaintiff recognizes that he has no liberty interest in good time earned at the state level | |
| 22 | under RCW §9.94A.728. He argues that he has a liberty interest in good time earned at the | |
| 23 24 | county level under RCW §9.92.151, and that the Court erred in dismissing his claim based upon | |
| 25 | the separate statutory schemes. | |
| 26 | Plaintiff's argument does not speak to the fact that he did not provide the "release | |
| 27 | address" the DOC required for early release. | |
| 28 | | |

ORDER - 1

The Rule 7(h) standard has not been met in this case, and the Court will not Reconsider its prior ruling. [Dkt. #16]. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Dkt. #19] is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 21st day of July, 2011. RONALD B. LEIGHTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE ORDER - 2