

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

RICHARD ROY SCOTT,

Plaintiff,

v.

KELLY CUNNINGHAM,

Defendant.

No. C11-5509 BHS/KLS

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
RECONSIDERATION

On September 26, 2011, the Court entered an Order regarding various motions filed by Plaintiff. ECF No. 44. Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of that Order. ECF No. 52. Having carefully considered the Plaintiff’s motion, the Court finds that it should be denied.

**DISCUSSION**

Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will ordinarily be denied in the “absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

Plaintiff objects to the Court’s Order striking the noting date of his Motion for Protective, Anti-Harassment motion (ECF No. 12) because it was not properly served on the Defendant. *See* ECF No. 44 at 1. Plaintiff was advised that he could re-file the motion after properly serving the

1 Defendant's counsel. *Id.* He has since filed two motions for temporary restraining order, which  
2 are noted for November 18, 2011. ECF Nos. 51 and 54.

3 Plaintiff objects to the Court's Order denying his motion to compel because he failed to  
4 include a certificate indicating that he had conferred with opposing counsel in accordance with  
5 Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(2)(B). ECF No. 44 at 2. Plaintiff was advised to file his motion after  
6 attempting to confer with counsel. *Id.* In his motion for reconsideration, the Plaintiff insists that  
7 he has done so and that the Defendant has produced "zero." ECF No. 52. Plaintiff may file a  
8 motion to compel as to specific discovery items he seeks to have produced if, after conferring  
9 with counsel, an agreement cannot be reached. Plaintiff must specify the information he seeks  
10 and the relevance that the information sought has to his claims in this lawsuit.

12 Plaintiff has identified no error in the Court's Order. Nor has he presented any new facts  
13 or legal authority. Therefore, reconsideration is inappropriate.

15 It is, therefore, **ORDERED:**

16 (1) Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 52) is **DENIED**.

17 (2) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel for  
18 Defendants.

20 **DATED** this 3rd day of November, 2011.

21   
22 Karen L. Strombom  
23 United States Magistrate Judge