

**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

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