

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
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BRADLEY MARSHALL,)	Case No. CV-11-5319 SC
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
)	MOTION TO ALTER OR AMEND
v.)	<u>THE JUDGMENT</u>
)	
WASHINGTON STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,)	
et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	

Plaintiff filed this action challenging his disbarment by the Washington Supreme Court. On May 23, 2012, the Court granted Defendants' motions for judgment on the pleadings on Rooker-Feldman and res judicata grounds and entered judgment in their favor. ECF Nos. 79 ("May 23 Order"), 81. Plaintiff now moves the Court to alter or amend the judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). ECF No. 84 ("Mot."). For the reasons described herein, the Motion is DENIED.

"Under Rule 59(e), it is appropriate to alter or amend a judgment if '(1) the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) the district court committed clear error or made an initial decision that was manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law.'" United Nat'l Ins. Co. v. Spectrum Worldwide, Inc., 555 F.3d 772, 779 (9th Cir. 2009) (quoting Zimmerman v. City of Oakland, 255 F.3d 734,

1 740 (9th Cir. 2001)). Here, Plaintiff has not shown that there is
2 newly-discovered evidence, or that the Court committed clear error
3 or made an initial decision that was manifestly unjust, or that
4 there was an intervening change in controlling law. In short, none
5 of the arguments set forth in Plaintiff's Motion give the Court
6 cause to doubt the reasoning of its May 24 Order.

7 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion is DENIED.

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10
11 Dated: June 8, 2012

12 
13 _____
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE