

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Golden Eagle Insurance Corporation v. Cammack

No. 24-cv-01670-AMO, United States District Court for the Northern District of California (April 7, 2025)

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration. The court held that Plaintiffs did not establish any of the grounds for reconsideration under Northern District of California Civil Local Rule 7-9 concerning the court’s prior order staying proceedings pending resolution of a state court case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Araceli Martinez-Olguin
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	April 7, 2025
DOCKET	24-cv-01670-AMO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs sought leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the Court's January 29, 2025 order staying proceedings pending resolution of a state court case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration requires the moving party to establish one of the grounds specified in Civil Local Rule 7-9(b).
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Golden Eagle Insurance Corporation, et al. v. Richard Cammack, et al.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- insurance
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- insurance
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiffs established a ground under Civil Local Rule 7-9(b) for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the order staying proceedings.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs failed to establish any of the grounds required by Civil Local Rule 7-9(b) for reconsideration, so their motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration was denied.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A party seeking reconsideration must show one of the following grounds for relief applies: (1) “a material difference in fact or law exists from that which was presented to the Court before entry of the [challenged] order,” and the party seeking reconsideration could not, with “reasonable diligence,” have known of such fact or law at the time of the order; (2) the “emergence of new material facts or a change of law occurring after the time of such order”; (3) a “manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments which were presented to the Court before such . . . order.”” (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The Court had stayed the proceedings pending resolution of a state court case. Plaintiffs argued that the Court failed to consider a California Court of Appeal decision, *Gordon v. Continental Cas. Co.*, in entering the stay order. The Court concluded that Plaintiffs had not shown any qualifying difference in fact or law, newly emerged material facts or change in law, or manifest failure to consider previously presented material facts or dispositive legal arguments.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court previously stayed the federal proceedings pending resolution of a state court case. Plaintiffs then moved for leave to seek reconsideration, arguing that the Court had failed to consider the California Court of Appeal's decision in *Gordon v. Continental Cas. Co.* The Court denied the motion because Plaintiffs failed to establish any ground for reconsideration under Civil Local Rule 7-9(b).

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Gordon v. Continental Cas. Co.*, 107 Cal. App. 5th 90 (2024)

OPINION

Golden Eagle Insurance Corporation v. Cammack

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3

4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

5 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

6 7 GOLDEN EAGLE INSURANCE Case No. 24-cv-01670-AMO CORPORATION, et al., 8
Plaintiffs, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’

9 MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE

v. MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

10 RICHARD CAMMACK, et al., Re: Dkt. No. 56 11 Defendants. 12 13 Before the Court is
Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the 14 Court’s January 29, 2025
order staying proceedings pending resolution of the state court case. 15 Plaintiffs contend that the
Court failed to consider the California Court of Appeal’s decision in 16 Gordon v. Continental Cas.
Co., 107 Cal. App. 5th 90 (2024). 17 A party seeking reconsideration must show one of the
following grounds for relief applies: 18 (1) “a material difference in fact or law exists from that
which was presented to the Court before 19 entry of the [challenged] order,” and the party seeking
reconsideration could not, with “reasonable 20 diligence,” have known of such fact or law at the
time of the order; (2) the “emergence of new 21 material facts or a change of law occurring after
the time of such order”; (3) a “manifest failure by 22 the Court to consider material facts or
dispositive legal arguments which were presented to the 23 Court before such . . . order.” See Civ.
L.R. 7-9(b). Plaintiffs fail to establish any of the above 24 grounds for reconsideration. 25 /// 26 ///
27 /// 1 Accordingly, the motion is hereby DENIED. 2 3 IT IS SO ORDERED. 4 || Dated: April 7,
2025 5 - 6 .

ARACELI MARTINEZ-OLGUIN

7 United States District Judge 8 9 10 11 12 15 QO 16 17 Z 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28