

1 Timothy P. Fox (CA Bar 157750)
tfox@creeclaw.org
2 Elizabeth Jordan*
ejordan@creeclaw.org
3 CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION AND
4 ENFORCEMENT CENTER
1245 E. Colfax Avenue, Suite 400
5 Denver, CO 80218
Tel: (303) 757-7901
6 Fax: (303) 872-9072

7 Lisa Graybill*
lisa.graybill@splcenter.org
8 Jared Davidson*
jared.davidson@splcenter.org
9 SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW
10 CENTER
201 St. Charles Avenue, Suite 2000
11 New Orleans, Louisiana 70170
Tel: (504) 486-8982
12 Fax: (504) 486-8947

Maia Fleischman*
maia.fleischman@splcenter.org
SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW
CENTER
2 South Biscayne Boulevard, Suite 3750

13 William F. Alderman (CA Bar 47381)
walderman@orrick.com
14 Jake Routhier (CA Bar 324452)
jrouthier@orrick.com
15 ORRICK, HERRINGTON &
16 SUTCLIFFE LLP
405 Howard Street
17 San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 773-5700
18 Fax: (415) 773-5759

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Shalini Goel Agarwal (CA Bar 254540)
2 *shalini.agarwal@splcenter.org*
3 SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER
4 106 East College Avenue, Suite 1010
5 Tallahassee, FL 32301
6 Tel: (850) 521-3024
7 Fax: (850) 521-3001

8 Mark Mermelstein (CA Bar 208005)
9 *mmermelstein@splcenter.org* ~~612 WBTH.M~~

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Defendants did not file their Motion for Reconsideration until nearly three months
 2 after being served and nearly two months after entering an appearance. ECF No.
 3 52. This was untimely. Moreover, Defendants offer no reason whatsoever for their
 4 months- *See Selectron*
 5 *Indus. Co.*, 2007 WL 5193735, at *3 (denying motion for reconsideration where
 6 for delay in filing). For this reason
 7 alone, Defendants motion for reconsideration should be denied.

8 Had Defendants timely sought reconsideration, they would still fail to satisfy
 9 any of the prerequisites for reconsideration prescribed by F.R.C.P. 59(e) and L.R.
 10 7-18. *See United States v. Certain Rights to and Interests in Shares of Series D*
 11 *Preferred Stock in Palantir Technologies*, No. CV 17-4446-DSF (PLAx), 2018
 12 WL 9903314, *1 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2018) (denying motion for reconsideration
 13 -

14 Although Defendants complain that this Court ruled before they could
 15
 16 the level of a manifest injustice necessitating reconsideration. Indeed, this Court
 17

18 *See Gonzalez*
 19 *v. Coverall N. Am., Inc*, No. EDCV 16-02287, 2017 WL 4653017, *3 (C.D. Cal.
 20 May 26, 2017) (Bernal, J.); *accord Honeywell Int’l., Inc. v. W. Support Grp.*, No.
 21 CV 12-00645-PHX-JAT, 2013 WL 2369919, *3 (D. Ari
 22 Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's decision to deny a second summary
 23

24 before they were given an opportunity to file a reply does not fall into any of the
 25 four situations that would entitle Defendants to reconsideration of that Or
 26
 27
 28

1 judgment is not a proper ground for seeking reconsideration pursuant to Local Rule
2 7.18(a) *Scottsdale Ins. Co.*, 389 F. Supp. 3d at 836.

3
4 *See Kona Enters., Inc.*, 229 F.3d at
5 890.

6 **B. The Court Acted Within Its Broad Discretion to Relate this Case**
7 **to *Torres* Given the Substantial Overlap of Law and Fact and to**
8 **Conserve Judicial Resources.**

9 In their Motion for Reconsideration, Defendants take great pains to parse
10 and magnify some of the differences between this case and *Torres*.¹ In so doing,
11 Defendants not only elide the crucial interconnections between the two cases but
12 also erroneously imply that the two cases must be the same in each and every
13 possible way in order to justify relating them. Not so.

14 Local Rule 83-1.3 vests trial courts with broad discretion to relate two cases
15 if *any* of the following three circumstances are present: the two cases

