

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.

**OPINION**

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