

**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

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