

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.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	James L. Robart
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	C23-1678JLR
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the court's November 18, 2025 order accepting his untimely response to Google's motion for summary judgment. The court denied reconsideration and rejected later untimely submissions.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Local Rule W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h), reconsideration is ordinarily denied absent manifest error, new facts, or new legal authority that could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- summary judgment
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Levy demonstrated manifest error, new facts, or intervening legal authority warranting reconsideration of the court's November 18, 2025 order.
2. Whether Levy's November 19 exhibit and later submissions were timely and should be considered in connection with Google's motion for summary judgment.

HOLDINGS

1. Reconsideration was unwarranted because Levy did not identify manifest error, present qualifying new circumstances or legal authority, or show an intervening change in law.
2. The exhibit filed on November 19, 2025 was timely, but the submissions filed between November 20 and December 1, 2025 were untimely and would not be considered in response to the court's prior order or Google's summary-judgment motion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Motions for reconsideration are disfavored[,]” and the court “will ordinarily deny such motions in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” (at 2)

“The court has reviewed Mr. Levy’s motion and concludes that he has not presented new circumstances, identified a court error, or shown an intervening change in law that would justify reconsideration of the court’s November 18, 2025 Order.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Levy filed his response to Google's summary-judgment motion on November 17, 2025, after the deadline. The court accepted the response and ordered him to file the exhibits cited in it by November 19; Levy filed one exhibit by that date and made four additional submissions between November 20 and December 1. His reconsideration motion again cited health issues, alleged errors in Google's record, and asserted that prior orders did not fully address the facts he provided.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Gary Levy filed an untimely response to Google LLC's motion for summary judgment. The court accepted the response, ordered Levy to file cited exhibits by November 19, 2025, and later received additional submissions. Levy then moved for reconsideration, seeking relief including correction of the docket, redaction of personal health information, and another extension of time. The court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Kona Enters., Inc. v. Est. of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)

