

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Nancy L. Knight v. County of Mohave, et al.

Knight · No. CV-25-08079-PCT-DJH · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Arizona denied Nancy L. Knight’s motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of her complaint with prejudice. The court held that the motion failed to comply with Local Rule 7.2(g), presented no new facts or manifest error, and did not alter the prior dismissal; the matter therefore remained closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Diane J. Humetewa
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Arizona
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	CV-25-08079-PCT-DJH
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the court's prior order granting Defendants' motions to dismiss and dismissing the Complaint with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration is ordinarily denied absent manifest error or new facts or legal authority that could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence. The movant must identify specifically what the court overlooked or misapprehended, explain why any new matter was not previously presented, and identify the requested modifications; the motion may not repeat prior arguments.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Nancy L. Knight v. County of Mohave, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff satisfied the requirements for reconsideration under Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.2(g).
2. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated manifest error, newly discovered facts, or new legal authority warranting reconsideration of the dismissal order.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration failed to comply with Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.2(g) because it did not identify qualifying overlooked or misapprehended matters, new facts or law unavailable earlier, or a proper basis for modifying the prior order, and it repeated or recast arguments related to the prior dismissal.
2. Plaintiff did not establish manifest error, new facts, or new legal authority, so reconsideration of the dismissal order was unwarranted.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A motion for reconsideration ordinarily will be denied "absent a showing of manifest error or a showing of new facts or legal authority that could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." (at 1)

"Overall, Plaintiff's "Motion to Reconsider neither discloses any new facts, nor reveals any manifest error of law." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court had previously dismissed Nancy L. Knight's Complaint with prejudice after granting Defendants' motions to dismiss. In her reconsideration motion, Knight objected to the prior order's description of the alleged constitutional violations, argued that Rules 19, 54, and 91 had been violated, and asserted that the Rooker-Feldman doctrine and Younger abstention did not apply to fraud upon the court. The court found that the identified rules had been considered, that the fraud-upon-the-court argument had not been raised earlier and lacked merit, and that the motion otherwise expressed dissatisfaction with the prior ruling.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On October 24, 2025, the District Court granted both sets of Defendants' motions to dismiss and dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice. Plaintiff filed a motion for reconsideration on October 30, 2025. The court denied reconsideration and ordered that the matter remain closed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Lemmen Meyer v. Mandig, 2019 WL 6336541, *2 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2019)
- Defs. of Wildlife v. Browner, 909 F. Supp. 1342, 1351 (D. Ariz. 1995)

OPINION

Knight

PER CURIAM.

1 WO 2 3 4 5

6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

8 9 Nancy L Knight, No. CV-25-08079-PCT-DJH 10 Plaintiff, ORDER 11 v. 12 County of
Mohave, et al., 13 Defendants. 14 15 The Court, on October 24, 2025, issued an Order granting
both sets of Defendants' 16 Motions to Dismiss and dismissing Plaintiff's Complaint with
prejudice. (Doc. 56). On

17 October 30, 2025, Plaintiff Nancy L. Knight filed a "Motion for Reconsideration of
18 Dismissal of Judge Napper." (Doc. 58). Because Defendants have been dismissed from 19 this
matter, no response was filed. 20 A motion for reconsideration ordinarily will be denied "absent a
showing of 21 manifest error or a showing of new facts or legal authority that could not have been
brought 22 to its attention earlier with reasonable diligence." LRCiv 7.2(g). Further, the motion
must 23 "point out with specificity the matters that the movant believes were overlooked or 24
misapprehended by the Court, any new matters being brought to the Court's attention for 25 the
first time and the reasons they were not presented earlier, and any specific modifications 26 being
sought in the Court's Order." Id. Finally, "[n]o motion for reconsideration ... may 27 repeat any
oral or written argument made by the movant in support of or in opposition to 28 the motion that
resulted in the Order." Id. The court may deny a motion for reconsideration if it fails to comply
with these rules. 29 Plaintiff's Motion fails to comply with the requirements of LRCiv 7.2(g). At
best || the Court can tell, Plaintiff takes objection to the first sentence of the Court's sixteen-page
Order because it mentions only the alleged constitutional violations in the Complaint and 5|| not
the alleged violations of Rules 19, 54, and 91. (See Doc. 58 at 2). However, the alleged 6||
violations of Rules 19, 54, and 91 were referenced in the Court's Order (see Doc. 56 at 2- 7| 3)
and duly considered in the Court's ultimate conclusion. Plaintiff also claims that the 8 || Rooker-
Feldman doctrine and Younger abstention do not apply to fraud upon the court. (Doc. 58 at 2). Not
only did Plaintiff not advance such an argument in her initial briefing, || but the argument is
without merit as Arizona does not recognize a private right of action 11 || for fraud upon the court.
See Lemmen Meyer v. Mandig, 2019 WL 6336541, *2 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2019). Otherwise, Plaintiffs
Motion merely expresses her dissatisfaction with the 13 || Court's Order. See Defs. of Wildlife v.
Browner, 909 F. Supp. 1342, 1351 (D. Ariz. 1995) ("A motion for reconsideration should not be
used to ask a court to rethink what the court || had already thought through—trightly or wrongly.")

(internal citations omitted). Overall, || Plaintiff’s “Motion to Reconsider neither discloses any new facts, nor reveals any manifest || error of law. The facts and circumstances which caused this Court to rule against 18 || Defendants have not changed.” Jd. 19 Accordingly, 20 IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration of Dismissal of Judge □□ Napper (Doc. 58) is DENIED. This matter shall remain closed. 22 Dated this 5th day of December, 2025. 23 24 Ye □□ 25 norable’ Diang/4. Humetewa 26 United States District Judge 27 28 _2-