

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Gary Levy v. Google LLC

Levy · No. C23-1678JLR · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington denies Gary Levy’s motion for reconsideration of an order accepting his untimely response to Google LLC’s motion for summary judgment. The court finds no manifest error, new circumstances, or intervening change in law, accepts one exhibit as timely, rejects later untimely submissions, and declines to grant further extensions.

OPINION

Levy

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

8

AT SEATTLE

9

10 GARY LEVY, CASE NO. C23-1678JLR

11 Plaintiff, ORDER v. 12

GOOGLE LLC,

13 Defendant. 14

15 Before the court is pro se Plaintiff Gary Levy’s filing titled “Plaintiff’s Ex Parte 16 Motion
Defect Record Forces Full Stop Input, Output Errata Require Rev, No Adversary 17 Renders Total
Failure,” which the court construes as a motion for reconsideration of the 18 court’s November 18,
2025 Order granting Mr. Levy’s request to accept his untimely 19 response to Defendant Google
LLC’s (“Google”) motion for summary judgment. (Mot. 20 (Dkt. # 76); 11/18/25 Order (Dkt. #
69); see also MSJ (Dkt. # 32).) Google opposes Mr. 21 Levy’s motion. (Resp. (Dkt. # 78).) Mr.
Levy petitions the court for relief previously 22 addressed in prior court orders, including to
“correct” the docket, redact personal health 1 information (“PHI”), and further extend Mr. Levy’s
deadline to respond to Google’s 2 motion for summary judgment. (Mot. at 6; see, e.g., 10/28/25
Order (Dkt. # 58) at 3-5 3 (addressing Mr. Levy’s arguments pertaining to some of the relief he
currently seeks).) 4 Being fully advised, the court DENIES Mr. Levy’s motion for reconsideration.
5 Here, Mr. Levy untimely filed his response to Google’s motion for summary 6 judgment on

November 17, 2025. (MSJ Resp. (Dkt. # 68).) The court accepted the 7 untimely filing and ordered Mr. Levy to file the exhibits he cited in his response by 8 November 19, 2025. (See 11/18/25 Order). On November 19, 2025, Mr. Levy filed a 9 single exhibit labeled “Exhibit 63-1-‘Clawback’”. (See Dkt. # 70.) Between November 10 20, 2025, and December 1, 2025, Mr. Levy filed four additional submissions with the 11 court. (See Dkt. ## 71, 72, 74, 77 (showing that Mr. Levy filed a copy of an email chain 12 with opposing counsel and three submissions further describing and documenting his 13 pursuit of medical care).) 14 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored[,]” and the court “will ordinarily 15 deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a 16 showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention 17 earlier with reasonable diligence.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h); see also *Kona 18 Enters., Inc. v. Est. of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted) 19 (setting forth that amending a court’s prior order is an “extraordinary remedy, to be used 20 sparingly”). The court has reviewed Mr. Levy’s motion and concludes that he has not 21 presented new circumstances, identified a court error, or shown an intervening change in 22 law that would justify reconsideration of the court’s November 18, 2025 Order. Rather, 1 Mr. Levy again describes his ongoing health issues, argues that the record provided by 2 Google contains errors, and asserts that the court’s prior orders do not fully 3 “comprehend” the facts that Mr. Levy provided. (Mot. at 2.) Therefore, the court denies 4 Mr. Levy’s motion for reconsideration. To the extent Mr. Levy intends for the exhibit he 5 filed on November 19, 2025 to be responsive to the court’s November 18, 2025 Order 6 and/or Google’s motion for summary judgment, the court considers this exhibit to be 7 timely. To the extent Mr. Levy intends for the documents he filed between November 8 20, 2025, and December 1, 2025, to be responsive to the court’s November 18, 2025 9 Order and/or Google’s motion for summary judgment, the court rejects these submissions 10 as untimely. 11 In conclusion, for the reason described herein, the court DENIES Mr. Levy’s 12 motion for reconsideration (Dkt. # 76) and rejects any untimely filed submissions in 13 opposition to Google’s motion. Furthermore, the court puts the parties on notice that it 14 will not consider any additional late-filed submissions in support of or in opposition to 15 Google’s motion for summary judgment and will not grant any additional extensions of 16 deadlines pertaining to the pending motion for summary judgment. 17 Dated this 3 rd day of December, 2025. A 18

JAMES L. ROBART

19 United States District Judge 20 21 22