

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

ZhiJie Zhu, et al. v. Shu-Mei Wang, et al.

Case No. C23-1395-JCC (W.D. Wash. Dec. 29, 2026) · No. C23-1395-JCC · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington denied Plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration of an order dismissing certain defendants based on a statute of limitations bar. The court held that Plaintiffs had not shown manifest error or presented new facts or legal authority that could not previously have been presented with reasonable diligence.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John C. Coughenour
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	January 29, 2026
DOCKET	C23-1395-JCC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs moved for reconsideration of the Court's prior order dismissing certain defendants based on a statute-of-limitations bar.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Reconsideration is appropriate only upon a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to the Court's attention earlier with reasonable diligence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	ZhiJie Zhu, et al. v. Shu-Mei Wang, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- statute of limitations
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Statute of limitations

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiffs satisfied the standard for reconsideration of the prior order dismissing certain defendants based on the statute of limitations.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs did not establish manifest error or present new facts or legal authority that could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence; therefore, reconsideration of the prior dismissal order was not warranted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored.” (at 1)

“A motion for reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly.” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Court had dismissed certain defendants based on a statute-of-limitations bar. In seeking reconsideration, Plaintiffs presented new facts, some outside the complaint and not appropriately subject to judicial notice, and legal arguments that could have been raised in earlier briefing.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court previously dismissed certain defendants from the action after concluding that Plaintiffs' claims against them were barred by the statute of limitations. Plaintiffs then moved for reconsideration, relying on new facts and legal arguments; the Court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ma v. Univ. of S. California, 2019 WL 1239269 (W.D. Wash. 2019)

OPINION

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR 1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 8 AT SEATTLE 9 ZHIJIE ZHU, et al., CASE NO. C23-1395-JCC 10 Plaintiffs, ORDER 11 v. 12 SHU-MEI WANG, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 16 196) of this Court's order dismissing certain defendants in this action based on a statute of 17 limitations bar (Dkt.

No. 194). Plaintiff, in moving for reconsideration of that order, introduces 18 new facts (some of which are outside of the complaint and not appropriately subject to judicial 19 notice) and makes

legal argument (some of which could have made in earlier briefing) as to why 20 the statute of limitations does not, in fact, bar Plaintiffs' claims against the defendants who 21 previously moved for dismissal.

22 Motions for reconsideration are generally disfavored. LCR 7(h)(1). Reconsideration is 23 only appropriate where there is "manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or 24 legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court's] attention earlier with 25 reasonable diligence." Id. "A motion for reconsideration should not be used to ask the court to 26 rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly." *Ma v. Univ. of S. 1 California*, 2019 WL 1239269, slip op. at 1 (W.D.

Wash. 2019). Plaintiff fails to meet this 2 standard. Thus, their motion for reconsideration (Dkt. No. 196) is DENIED. 3 4 DATED this 29th day of December 2026. A 5 6 7 John C. Coughenour 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26