

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

OPINION

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.

Jd. 2 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-