

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Gregory Goods v. David Baughman, et al.

Goods v. Baughman · No. No. 2:23-cv-02790-DJC-SCR P · Decided May 29, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denies Gregory Goods's motion to alter or amend judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). The court concludes that the motion does not identify a manifest error, newly discovered evidence, manifest injustice, or intervening change in controlling law, and does not address the underlying dismissal for failure to state a plausible claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Daniel J. Calabretta
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 29, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:23-cv-02790-DJC-SCR P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing his section 1983 action for failure to state a plausible claim for relief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A district court has considerable discretion in granting or denying a Rule 59(e) motion. Such a motion is generally available only for manifest errors of law or fact, newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, a manifestly unjust decision, or an intervening change in controlling law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order with limited precedential value.
PARTIES	Gregory Goods v. David Baughman, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- section 1983
- prisoners rights

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Civil rights

Prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff established a basis under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment dismissing his section 1983 action.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff did not identify manifest error, newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law; therefore, his Rule 59(e) motion was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Although Rule 59 (e) permits a district court to reconsider and amend a previous order, the rule offers an ‘extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.’” (at 1)

“The Ninth Circuit has held a motion to alter or amend judgment under Rule 59(e) is “usually available only when (1) the court committed manifest errors of law or fact, (2) the court is presented with newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, (3) the decision was manifestly unjust, or (4) there is an intervening change in the controlling law.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff Gregory Goods pursued a section 1983 action that was dismissed for failure to state a plausible claim for relief. In support of his Rule 59(e) motion, he asserted that institutional barriers to his access to the law library limited his ability to perform the legal work needed to pursue the lawsuit. The court found that these assertions did not establish any recognized basis for altering or amending the judgment.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The action was dismissed because Plaintiff failed to state a plausible claim for relief under section 1983. Plaintiff then filed a Rule 59(e) motion, arguing that institutional barriers to his access to the law library impaired his ability to perform the legal work necessary to pursue the action. The district court denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Estate of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000)
- Rishor v. Ferguson, 822 F.3d 482, 491-92 (9th Cir. 2016)

OPINION

(PC) Goods v. Baughman

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 GREGORY GOODS, No. 2:23-cv-02790-DJC-SCR P

12 Plaintiff, 13 v. ORDER 14 DAVID BAUGHMAN, et al., 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff has
filed a motion to amend or alter judgment pursuant to Federal Rule 18 of Civil Procedure 59(e).
(ECF No. 24.) Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a 19 party may file a “motion to alter
or amend a judgment” within “28 days after the entry 20 of the judgment.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e).
“Although Rule 59 (e) permits a district court 21 to reconsider and amend a previous order, the
rule offers an ‘extraordinary remedy, to 22 be used sparingly in the interests of finality and
conservation of judicial resources.’ ” 23 Kona Enterprises, Inc. v. Est. of Bishop, 229 F.3d 877,
890 (9th Cir. 2000) (quoting 6 24 James Wm. Moore, et al., Moore's Federal Practice § 54.78[1]
(3d ed. 2000)). The 25 Ninth Circuit has held a motion to alter or amend judgment under Rule
59(e) is 26 “usually available only when (1) the court committed manifest errors of law or fact, (2)
27 the court is presented with newly discovered or previously unavailable evidence, (3) 28 the
decision was manifestly unjust, or (4) there is an intervening change in the 1 | controlling law.”
Rishorv. Ferguson, 822 F.3d 482, 491-92 (9th Cir. 2016) (citations 2 || omitted). The district court
enjoys considerable discretion in granting or denying the 3 | motion to alter or amend judgment.
See id. at 492 (citation omitted). 4 Plaintiff's Motion fails to identify an appropriate basis to alter
or amend 5 | judgment under Rule 59. Plaintiff does not show any manifest errors of law or fact, 6
| provide newly discovered evidence, establish that the decision was manifestly unjust, 7 |
or identify an intervening change in the controlling law. Id. at 491-92. Instead, 8 | Plaintiff argues
that CDCR's institutional barriers to Plaintiff's access to the law library 9 | inhibit his ability to
perform the necessary legal work to pursue a lawsuit. (ECF No. 24 10 | at 1-2.) These arguments
do not address any valid basis for amending or altering 11 | judgment. They also fail to address the
underlying basis for the dismissal of this action 12 | based on Plaintiff's failure to state a plausible
claim for relief under section 1983. 13 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Alter or Amend
Judgment under Rule 59e) 14 | (ECF No. 24) is DENIED. 15 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 | Dated:
_May 29, 2025 “Daal CoO □□□□ Hon. Daniel □□ |. Cod

18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

19 20 21 | DJC1 - Goods23cv02790.alterjudgment 22 23 24 25 26 27 28