

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON

Linda Cook v. Ben Hossienzadeh et al.

Case No. 2:25-cv-02013-JHC (W.D. Wash. Jan. 5, 2026) · No. 2:25-cv-02013-JHC · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Western District of Washington denies Linda Cook’s motion for reconsideration of an order denying her motions for judicial recusal and case reassignment. The court finds the motion untimely and concludes that it fails to demonstrate manifest error, while directing the Clerk to refer the motion concerning a separate order to Chief Judge David Estudillo for further review.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John H. Chun
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Western District of Washington
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	2:25-cv-02013-JHC
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of an order denying her motions for judicial recusal and case reassignment and a subsequent order affirming that denial.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration is an extraordinary and disfavored remedy; it ordinarily requires a showing of manifest error or new facts or legal authority that could not previously have been presented with reasonable diligence. The motion must also comply with Local Civil Rule 7(h)'s fourteen-day deadline and specificity requirements.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of Judge Chun's order was timely under Local Civil Rule 7(h)(2).
2. Whether Plaintiff established manifest error or another sufficient basis for reconsidering Judge Chun's order under Local Civil Rule 7(h)(1).
3. Whether the portion of the motion challenging Chief Judge Estudillo's order should be referred to Chief Judge Estudillo for further review.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for reconsideration was properly denied because it was filed more than fourteen days after Judge Chun's November 24, 2025 order and therefore was untimely under Local Civil Rule 7(h)(2).
2. Plaintiff failed to establish manifest error or otherwise satisfy the high standard for reconsideration of Judge Chun's order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy” and is generally disfavored.” (1)

“Mere disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Linda Cook previously sought recusal of Judge Chun and reassignment of the case. Judge Chun denied those motions, and Chief Judge David Estudillo affirmed the denial. Cook later moved for reconsideration, asserting that the prior ruling contained clear legal error, but filed the motion more than fourteen days after Judge Chun's order.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Judge Chun denied Plaintiff's motions for recusal and case reassignment on November 24, 2025. Chief Judge David Estudillo affirmed that denial on December 1, 2025. Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration on December 29, 2025. The court denied reconsideration of Judge Chun's order as untimely and meritless, and directed the Clerk to refer the portion concerning Chief Judge Estudillo's order to him for further review.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kona Enters., Inc. v. Est. of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Munoz v. Locke, 2013 WL 12177035, at *2 (W.D. Wash. Feb. 8, 2013)

- Innovative Sols. Int'l, Inc. v. Houlihan Trading Co., 2025 WL 1135037, at *1 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 17, 2025)
- Wilcox v. Hamilton Constr., LLC, 426 F. Supp. 3d 788, 791 (W.D. Wash. 2019)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE 7 LINDA COOK, CASE NO. 2:25-cv-02013-JHC 8 Plaintiff, ORDER 9 v. 10 BEN
HOSSIENZADEH ET AL., 11 Defendants. 12 13 14 This matter comes before the Court on pro se
Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. 15 Dkt. # 23.

The Motion requests reconsideration of two orders: (1) Judge Chun's November 24, 16 2025
Order denying Plaintiff's motions for recusal and case reassignment (Dkt. # 13); and (2) 17 Chief
Judge David Estudillo's December 1, 2025 Order affirming Judge Chun's denial of 18 Plaintiff's
motions (Dkt. # 14).

For the reasons below, the Court DENIES the Motion with 19 respect to the order at Dkt. # 13 and
DIRECTS the Clerk to refer the Motion to Chief Judge 20 David Estudillo for further review. 21
Reconsideration is an "extraordinary remedy" and is generally disfavored. *Kona Enters., 22 Inc. v.*
Est. of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000); see also LCR 7(h)(1) ("Motions for 23
reconsideration are disfavored.").

Accordingly, "[t]he court will ordinarily deny such motions in 24 1 the absence of a showing of
manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal 2 authority which could not
have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." 3 LCR 7(h)(1). "'Manifest
error' is 'an error that is plain and indisputable, and that amounts to a 4 complete disregard of the
controlling law or the credible evidence in the record.'" *Munoz v. 5 Locke*, 2013 WL 12177035, at
*2 (W.D.

Wash. Feb. 8, 2013) (quoting BLACK'S LAW 6 DICTIONARY (9th ed. 2009)). "Mere
disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis 7 for reconsideration," *id.*, and
"reconsideration should not be used to ask the Court to 'rethink 8 what it had already thought
through—rightly or wrongly.'" *Innovative Sols. Int'l, Inc. v. 9 Houlihan Trading Co.*, 2025 WL
1135037, at *1 (W.D.

Wash. Apr. 17, 2025) (quoting *Wilcox v. 10 Hamilton Constr., LLC*, 426 F. Supp. 3d 788, 791
(W.D. Wash. 2019)). 11 Additionally, motions for reconsideration must comply with certain
procedure and timing 12 requirements. See LCR 7(h)(2).

The Local Rules require a motion for reconsideration to: (1) be 13 "filed within fourteen days after
the order to which it relates is filed"; and (2) "point out with 14 specificity the matters which the
movant believes were overlooked or misapprehended by the 15 court, any new matters being
brought to the court's attention for the first time, and the particular 16 modifications being sought
in the court's prior ruling." *Id.* They also note that "[f]ailure to 17 comply with [these instructions]

may be grounds for denial of the motion.” Id. 18 Here, Plaintiff’s Motion fails to satisfy the applicable standards.

To begin, Plaintiff’s 19 Motion is untimely and thus can be dismissed on this ground alone. Plaintiff filed this Motion on 20 December 29, 2025, more than 14 days after November 24, 2025 (the date of Judge Chun’s 21 Order).

As motions for reconsideration must be “filed within fourteen days after the order to 22 which it relates is filed[,]” Plaintiff’s Motion is clearly untimely. See LCR 7(h)(2). But even if 23 Plaintiff’s Motion were timely, the Court would still deny Plaintiff’s request to reconsider the 24 Order at Dkt. # 13.

Although Plaintiff disagrees with the Court’s prior ruling and states that it l committed “clear legal error,” Plaintiff’s Motion fails to establish a “manifest error,” i.e., “an 2 error that is plain and indisputable, and that amounts to a complete disregard of the controlling 3 law or the credible evidence in the record.” See Munoz, 2013 WL 12177035, at *2.

The Court 4 || thus finds that Plaintiff has failed to meet the high bar for reconsideration under Local Rule 5 7(h)(1) and DENIES Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration with respect to the order at Dkt. # 6 13. 7 The Court DIRECTS the Clerk to refer this matter to Chief Judge David Estudillo for 8 further review. 9 Dated this Sth day of January, 2026. 10 Cob 4.

Chur John H.Chun United States District Judge 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24