

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Shawna Montes v. Catalyst Brands LLC, SPARC Group LLC, and
Penney Opco LLC

Montes · No. 2:25-CV-0281-TOR · Decided January 8, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington denied Shawna Montes’s motion for reconsideration. The court held that reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy and found no basis to revisit its prior order.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington
DECIDED	January 8, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-CV-0281-TOR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the court's prior order, ECF No. 14. The district court considered the motion without oral argument and denied it.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy to be used sparingly and is generally appropriate only in extraordinary circumstances, such as when the prior decision was clearly erroneous and would work a manifest injustice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should reconsider its prior order under the law-of-the-case doctrine and the extraordinary-circumstances standard.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court denied Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration because Plaintiff did not establish extraordinary circumstances justifying revisiting the prior order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“As a rule, a court should be “loathe” to revisit its own decisions “in the absence of extraordinary circumstances such as where the initial decision was ‘clearly erroneous and would work a manifest injustice.’” (at 2)

“While the district court possesses inherent power to reconsider and amend previous orders, this is an extraordinary remedy that should be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion does not discuss the underlying factual allegations or merits of the dispute. It addresses only Plaintiff's request that the district court reconsider its prior order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court had previously entered an order addressing the issues presented in the case. Plaintiff then filed a motion for reconsideration, ECF No. 16. The court concluded that reconsideration was not warranted and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Christianson v. Colt Industries Operating Corp., 486 U.S. 800, 817 (1988)
- United States v. Alexander, 106 F.3d 874, 876 (9th Cir. 1997)
- Thomas v. Bible, 983 F.2d 152, 154 (9th Cir. 1993)

OPINION

Montes

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4

5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

6 7 SHAWNA MONTES, for herself, as a private attorney general, and on NO. 2:25-CV-0281-

TOR 8 behalf of all others similarly situation,

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION

9 Plaintiff, FOR RECONSIDERATION 10 v.

11 CATALYST BRANDS LLC, SPARC

GROUP LLC and PENNEY OPCO

12 LLC,

13 Defendant. 14 BEFORE THE COURT is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No.

15 16). This matter was submitted for consideration without oral argument. The 16 Court has

reviewed the record and files herein and is fully informed. For the 17 reasons discussed below,

Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 16, is 18 DENIED. 19 As a rule, a court should

be "loathe" to revisit its own decisions "in the 20 absence of extraordinary circumstances such as

where the initial decision was 'clearly erroneous and would work a manifest injustice.'" 21

Christianson v. Colt 2|| Indus. Operating Corp., 486 U.S. 800, 817 (1988) (internal citation

omitted). This principle is embodied in the law of the case doctrine, under which "a court is

generally precluded from reconsidering an issue that has already been decided by 5|| the same

court, or a higher court in the identical case." United States v. Alexander, 6|| 106 F.3d 874, 876

(9th Cir. 1997) (quoting Thomas v. Bible, 983 F.2d 152, 154 (9th Cir. 1993)). While the district

court possesses inherent power to reconsider 8 || and amend previous orders, this is an

extraordinary remedy that should be used 9|| sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation

of judicial resources. 10|| Here, the Court has fully addressed the issues and the Court's Order

stands. ECF No. 14. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED: 13 Plaintiff's Motion for

Reconsideration, ECF No. 16, is DENIED. 14 The District Court Executive is directed to enter this

Order and furnish copies to counsel. 16 DATED January 8, 2026. <> United States District Judge

19 20