

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Broderick Warfield v. Solano County Superior Court, et al.

Warfield · No. 2:25-cv-00557-TLN-SCR · Decided November 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Broderick Warfield’s motion for reconsideration of the court’s prior order dismissing his action with prejudice. The court held that Warfield had not shown manifest error, newly discovered evidence, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). The court also denied his request for a protective order as unclear and denied the remaining pending motions as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Troy L. Nunley
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 3, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-cv-00557-TLN-SCR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) for reconsideration of the court's prior order dismissing the action with prejudice and requested a protective order.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the discretionary Rule 59(e) standard, under which reconsideration generally requires newly discovered evidence, clear error, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law. The court also evaluated the protective-order request based on the clarity and sufficiency of the request.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished, nonprecedential district court order
PARTIES	Broderick Warfield v. Solano County Superior Court, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

Civil procedure

Federal courts

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Warfield established a valid ground under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) for altering or amending the judgment dismissing his action with prejudice.
2. Whether Warfield was entitled to a protective order when his request was unclear and no protective order had been entered in the case.

HOLDINGS

1. Reconsideration was properly denied because Warfield did not establish a manifest error of law or fact, newly discovered evidence, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law.
2. The request for a protective order was denied because it was unclear what relief Warfield sought, no protective order had been entered in the case, and the court declined to reopen the action.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A motion for reconsideration may not be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation.” (at 2)

“The Court will not accept any further filings in this case.” (at 4)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Warfield's action involved approximately fifteen defendants, including law enforcement divisions, state court judges, county prosecutors, and public defenders, and concerned two 911 calls made in November 2011. Before judgment, Warfield filed several motions, including motions to seal and a joinder motion containing materials he later characterized as newly discovered evidence. After the action was dismissed with prejudice, he sought reconsideration based on allegedly overlooked exhibits and new evidence and requested that an unspecified umbrella protective order be extended to documents in other cases.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Warfield filed a complaint concerning two 911 calls made in November 2011 and later filed a first and second amended complaint without leave of court. A magistrate judge recommended dismissal without leave to amend, and the district court adopted that recommendation on May 30, 2025, dismissed the action with prejudice, and entered judgment. Warfield then moved for reconsideration and requested a protective order; the district court denied both requests and denied all other pending motions as moot.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Schroeder v. McDonald, 55 F.3d 454, 458–59 (9th Cir. 1995)
- Rishor v. Ferguson, 822 F.3d 482, 490 (9th Cir. 2016)
- Am. Ironworks & Erectors, Inc. v. N. Am. Const. Corp., 248 F.3d 892, 898–99 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Allstate Ins. Co. v. Herron, 634 F.3d 1101, 1111 (9th Cir. 2011)
- McDowell v. Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1255 n.1 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Marlyn Nutraceuticals, Inc. v. Mucos Pharma GmbH & Co., 571 F.3d 873, 880 (9th Cir. 2009)
- Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker, 554 U.S. 471, 485 n.5 (2008)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/broderick-warfield-v-solano-county-superior-court-et-al-lwllf7tf>