

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

JOHN DOE #1, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SAM REED, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C09-5456BHS

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs’ motion to reconsider the Court’s order granting the intervention of Washington Families Standing Together (“WFST”) and Washington Coalition for Open Government (“WCOG”). Dkt. 124. The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby denies the motion for the reasons stated herein.

On September 3, 2009, the Court granted the motions to intervene by WFST and WCOG. *See* Dkt. 62 (granting motions at preliminary injunction hearing). On September 10, 2010, the Court granted a preliminary injunction in this matter. Dkt. 63. The matter then went up on appeal and reached the United States Supreme Court, which reversed and

1 remanded for further proceedings in this Court. Dkt. 102. The Court thereafter regained
2 jurisdiction over this matter. Dkt. 104 (mandate of the United States Supreme Court).

3 On September 3, 2010, Plaintiffs filed the instant motion to reconsider the Court's
4 prior grant of intervention as it related to WFST and WCOG. Dkt. 124. Plaintiffs argue
5 that the intervention of WFST and WCOG is no longer proper and that the Court should
6 reconsider its prior granting of their intervention. *See generally* Dkt. 124.

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

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

12 The Court recognizes, and Plaintiffs point out, that the nature of the case has
13 substantially changed, considering the reversal and remand of the Court's order granting
14 Plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. However, Plaintiffs have not adequately
15 met their burden on reconsideration to warrant reconsideration of the Court's grant of
16 intervention to WFST and WCOG.

17 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' motion to reconsider (Dkt. 124)
18 is **DENIED**.

19 DATED this 5th day of October, 2010.

20
21 

22 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27
28