

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

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.’”
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/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-washington-united-states-district-court-for/2026/shawna-montes-v-catalyst-brands-llc-sparc-group-llc-and-46dh1ks0>