

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

7 CHRISTINE D. HAUCK,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 PHILLIP D. WALKER, et al.,

11 Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-5729 BHS

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

12
13 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Christine Hauck's ("Hauck")
14 motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 28).

15 On February 25, 2014, Defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 18.
16 On March 31, 2014, the Court granted the motion. Dkt. 28. On April 8, 2014, Hauck
17 filed a motion for reconsideration. Dkt. 28.

18 Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule CR 7(h), which provides
19 as follows:

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

1 Local Rule CR 7(h)(1).

2 Although Hauck raises numerous issues, she fails to show that reconsideration is
3 warranted. For example, Hauck argues that the Court should have granted her leave to
4 amend her complaint instead of dismissing her claims. Dkt. 28 at 4. Defendants,
5 however, moved for summary judgment, which requires an evaluation of the facts
6 submitted in support of each position instead of the allegations contained in the
7 complaint. Hauck's failure to submit facts sufficient to create a question of fact on the
8 issues of whether Defendants violated her constitutional rights was dispositive of these
9 issues and leave to amend would not cure such a deficiency. Moreover, Hauck "disputes
10 Defendants' assertions the submitted warrant [for her arrest] is a true and accurate copy."
11 Dkt. 28 at 6. Hauck alleges that "Defendants altered the warrant to influence the court on
12 Deputy Walker's credibility." *Id.* Unsupported allegations do not create a question of
13 fact, and there is no dispute that a warrant issued for Hauck's arrest on two felony
14 charges. Hauck fails to show that the Court made a manifest error of law in concluding
15 that execution of the warrant did not violate any of Hauck's constitutional rights.
16 Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Hauck's motion for reconsideration.

17 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

18 Dated this 9th day of April, 2014.

19 

20
21 **BENJAMIN H. SETTLE**
22 United States District Judge