

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT SEATTLE

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,

Case No. C70-9213 RSM

9 Plaintiffs,

Subproceeding No. 17-03

10 v.

ORDER DENYING STILLAGUAMISH'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

11
12 STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

13 Defendants.
14

15
16 This matter comes before the Court on the Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians' Motion for
17 Reconsideration of Order Denying Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians' Motion to Hold Tulalip Tribes
18 in Civil Contempt and For Sanctions. Dkt. #60.¹ Stillaguamish points out that the Court's Order
19 (Dkt. #59²) did not cite to, and therefore may not have considered, its reply (Dkt. #56³) to
20 Tulalip's response (Dkt. #54⁴). The Court acknowledges that it overlooked the reply and thanks
21 Stillaguamish for bringing the oversight to the Court's attention.
22

23
24 ¹ Dkt. #21,816 in Case No. C70-9213RSM.


25 ² Dkt. #21815 in Case No. C70-9213.

26 ³ Dkt. #21808 in Case No. C70-9213. Stillaguamish also filed the Declaration of Kathryn
27 Konoski in support of its reply. Dkt. #57 (Dkt. #21809 in Case No. C70-9213).

28 ⁴ Dkt. #21806 in Case No. C70-9213.

1 As stated in Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1), “[m]otions for reconsideration are disfavored.”
2 Consequently, the Court will “ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of
3 manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not
4 have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” LCR 7(h)(1).
5 However, having reviewed the reply, the Court does not find that anything in that reply, or the
6 declaration in support thereof, would alter the Court’s prior Order or demonstrate manifest error.
7 Accordingly, the Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. #60 and Dkt. #21,816 in Case No. C70-
8 9213RSM) is DENIED.
9

10 DATED this 10 day of September 2018.

11 

12 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
13 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28