

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Tufono v. York

Tufono · No. 2:24-cv-00164-TLN-CKD · Decided July 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied pro se Plaintiff Arvello L. Tufono’s motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of his action without prejudice. The court construed the motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) and found that Plaintiff had not established grounds for relief from the prior judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	July 10, 2025
DOCKET	2:24-cv-00164-TLN-CKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) for reconsideration and relief from the court's prior final judgment dismissing the action without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion filed within 28 days of judgment is treated as a Rule 59(e) motion; otherwise, it is treated as a Rule 60(b) motion. Relief under Rule 60(b) requires a qualifying ground for relief and a motion filed within a reasonable time. On de novo review, the court concluded that the dismissal was neither manifestly unjust nor clearly erroneous. The court also referenced the clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard for review of a magistrate judge's ruling under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (A).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district-court order

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- motions to dismiss

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion filed thirty days after entry of judgment should be construed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b) rather than Rule 59(e).
2. Whether Plaintiff established a ground for relief from the final judgment under Rule 60(b).
3. Whether the prior dismissal was manifestly unjust or clearly erroneous.

HOLDINGS

1. A motion for reconsideration filed more than 28 days after entry of judgment is treated as a Rule 60(b) motion rather than a Rule 59(e) motion.
2. Plaintiff was not entitled to relief under Rule 60(b) because he did not identify or establish any applicable Rule 60(b) ground, including mistake, excusable neglect, newly discovered evidence, fraud, voidness, satisfaction of judgment, or another reason justifying relief.
3. The prior dismissal was neither manifestly unjust nor clearly erroneous, and Plaintiff therefore failed to establish sufficient grounds for reconsideration.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law.” (at 2)

“A motion for reconsideration may not be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendant's motion to revoke his in forma pauperis status and to the magistrate judge's order directing him to respond. Plaintiff later asserted that mental-health symptoms, homelessness, loss of medication, incarceration, and difficulty receiving mail prevented compliance. The court found that Plaintiff did not adequately explain his initial failure to respond and noted that service of the prior dismissal order and judgment had been returned as undeliverable.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A magistrate judge recommended dismissal after Plaintiff failed to respond to Defendant's motion to revoke Plaintiff's in forma pauperis status and to comply with an order directing a response. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations, dismissed the action without prejudice, and entered judgment on December 16, 2024. Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration thirty days after entry of judgment; the court construed it as a Rule 60(b) motion and denied it.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Schroeder v. McDonald, 55 F.3d 454, 458-59 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Rishor v. Ferguson, 822 F.3d 482, 490 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Am. Ironworks & Erectors, Inc. v. N. Am. Const. Corp., 248 F.3d 892, 898-99 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P'ship, 507 U.S. 380, 393 (1993)
- Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp., 486 U.S. 847, 863 n.11 (1988)
- Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Martinez v. Lawless, No. 1:12-cv-01301-LJO-SKO, 2015 WL 5732549, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2015)
- Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield, 634 F. Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 1986), aff'd in part and rev'd in part on other grounds, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987)

OPINION

(PC) Tufono v. York

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 ARVELLO L. TUFONO, No. 2:24-cv-00164-TLN-CKD

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER

14 C. YORK,

15 Defendant. 16

17 This matter is before the Court on pro se Plaintiff Arvello L. Tufono's ("Plaintiff") 18 Motion
for Reconsideration of the Court's December 16, 2024 Order. (ECF No. 32.) No 19 opposition has
been filed. For the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion. 20 /// 21 /// 22 ///
23 /// 24 /// 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 ///

1 I. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

2 A detailed recitation of the factual and procedural history is not necessary for disposition 3 of
Plaintiff's motion. On October 17, 2024, the magistrate judge issued findings and 4
recommendations, recommending the action be dismissed without prejudice for Plaintiff's failure
5 to respond to Defendant C. York's ("Defendant") motion to revoke Plaintiff's in forma pauperis
6 status. (ECF No. 28.) Plaintiff did not file objections to the findings and recommendations. On
7 December 16, 2024, this Court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the
8 action without prejudice for failure to comply with the magistrate judge's September 9, 2024 9
order, and closed the case. (ECF No. 29.) On the same day, the Clerk of the Court entered 10

Judgment. (ECF No. 30.) Plaintiff now seeks reconsideration of the Court's December 16, 2024 11 Order. (ECF No. 32.)

12 II. STANDARD OF LAW

13 The Court may grant reconsideration under either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 14 ("Rule") 59(e) or 60(b). See *Schroeder v. McDonald*, 55 F.3d 454, 458–59 (9th Cir. 1995). A 15 motion to alter or amend a judgment under Rule 59(e) must be filed no later than 28 days after the 16 entry of judgment. Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Therefore, a "motion for reconsideration" is treated as a 17 motion to alter or amend judgment under Rule 59(e) if it is filed within 28 days of entry of 18 judgment; otherwise, it is treated as a Rule 60(b) motion for relief from judgment or order. 19 *Rishor v. Ferguson*, 822 F.3d 482, 490 (9th Cir. 2016); see *Am. Ironworks & Erectors, Inc. v. N. 20 Am. Const. Corp.*, 248 F.3d 892, 898–99 (9th Cir. 2001). Here, Plaintiff's motion was filed thirty 21 days after entry of judgment and is therefore construed as a motion for relief from final judgment 22 under Rule 60(b). (See ECF Nos. 10, 11.) 23 Under Rule 60(b), the Court may relieve Plaintiff from a final judgment, order, or 24 proceeding "for any of the following reasons: (1) mistake, inadvertence, surprise, or excusable 25 neglect; (2) newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been 26 discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b); (3) fraud (whether previously called 27 intrinsic or extrinsic), misrepresentation, or misconduct by an opposing party; (4) the judgment is 28 void; (5) the judgment has been satisfied, released, or discharged; it is based on an earlier 1 judgment that has been reversed or vacated; or applying it prospectively is no longer equitable; or 2 (6) any other reason that justifies relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). 3 A motion based on Rule 60(b) must be made "within a reasonable time." Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 60(c)(1). With respect to subsections (1), (2), and (3), the motion must be filed "no more than a 5 year after the entry of judgment or order or the date of the proceeding." *Id.* Rule 60(b)(6) goes 6 further, empowering the court to reopen a judgment even after one year has passed. *Pioneer Inv. 7 Servs. Co. v. Brunswick Assocs. Ltd. P'ship*, 507 U.S. 380, 393 (1993). However, subsections (1) 8 through (3) are mutually exclusive of subsection (6), and thus a party who failed to take timely 9 action due to "excusable neglect" may not seek relief more than a year after the judgment by 10 resorting to subsection (6). *Id.* (citing *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 11 847, 863, n.11 (1988)). 12 "A motion for reconsideration should not be granted, absent highly unusual 13 circumstances, unless the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed 14 clear error, or if there is an intervening change in the controlling law." *Marlyn Nutraceuticals, 15 Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co. (Marlyn)*, 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009). Further, "[a] 16 motion for reconsideration may not be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the first 17 time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation." *Id.* (emphasis in 18 original).

19 III. ANALYSIS

20 Plaintiff does not provide any facts or argument to satisfy any of the enumerated 21 provisions of Rule 60(b). Plaintiff asserts he began experiencing extreme mental psychosis 22 (manic

episodes) on September 13, 2024, and he was released from custody on October 23, 2024. (ECF No. 32 at 3.) Plaintiff notes he was not able to secure housing and his 30-day supply of “psych medication” went missing. (Id.) Plaintiff states he “was never able to secure housing or 25 income to provide the court with a mailing address,” as he has been homeless and unmedicated 26 since his release, with the exception of specifically enumerated dates. (Id.) Plaintiff notes these 27 dates (November 29, 2024 to December 3, 2024, December 13, 2024 to December 18, 2024, 28 December 24, 2024 to December 29, 2024, and January 2, 2025 to January 8, 2025) reflect the 1 time he spent “serving CDCR parole violations in Sac[ramento] County Jail and Yolo County.” 2 (Id.) Plaintiff asserts he has been “consistently incarcerated” in Sacramento County Jail since 3 January 9, 2025 to the present. (Id.) The docket reflects that Plaintiff was served with the 4 magistrate judge’s October 17, 2024 findings and recommendations, but indeed the attempted 5 service by mail of the Court’s December 16, 2024 Order and Judgment was returned as 6 undeliverable. On May 30, 2025, Plaintiff filed a notice of change of address to Sacramento 7 County Mail Jail. (ECF No. 31.) While the Court is sympathetic to Plaintiff’s situation, it 8 nonetheless finds Plaintiff does not adequately explain why he initially failed to respond to 9 Defendant’s motion to revoke his in forma pauperis status or the magistrate judge’s September 9, 10 2024 order directing him to respond to Defendant’s motion. 11 Plaintiff does not present any newly discovered evidence suggesting the matter was 12 wrongly dismissed. *Marlyn*, 571 F.3d at 880. Further, the Court finds upon a de novo review of 13 this case that the order of dismissal is neither manifestly unjust nor clearly erroneous. See 14 *Martinez v. Lawless*, No. 1:12-cv-01301-LJO-SKO, 2015 WL 5732549, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 15 2015) (citing *Kern-Tulare Water Dist. v. City of Bakersfield*, 634 F. Supp. 656, 665 (E.D. Cal. 16 1986), *aff’d in part and rev’d in part* on other grounds, 828 F.2d 514 (9th Cir. 1987)) (reviewing 17 a magistrate judge’s ruling under the “clearly erroneous or contrary to law” standard set forth 18 under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A)). Accordingly, the Court finds Plaintiff has not established 19 sufficient grounds under Rule 60(b) to seek reconsideration of the Court’s December 16, 2024 20 Order.

21 IV. CONCLUSION

22 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration is DENIED. (ECF No. 23 32.) 24 IT IS SO ORDERED. 25 Date: July 9, 2025 26 27 28