

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished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)