

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.

OPINION

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.’” *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

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-was/2026/shawna-montes-v-catalyst-brands-llc-sparc-group-llc-and-46dh1ks0>