

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Christopher W. Castle v. St. Charles Health System, Inc.

Castle · No. 6:23-cv-01217-AA · Decided May 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Oregon denied Christopher W. Castle’s motion for reconsideration of the order granting summary judgment to St. Charles Health System, Inc. The court held that the motion was untimely under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(c)(1) and that the plaintiff had not shown newly discovered evidence, clear error, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law. The order was dated May 29, 2026.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Ann Aiken
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Oregon
DECIDED	May 29, 2026
DOCKET	6:23-cv-01217-AA
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(c)(1) for reconsideration of the court's prior order granting summary judgment to Defendant.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy used sparingly and is appropriate upon newly discovered evidence, clear error or manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law. A Rule 60(c)(1) motion must be filed within a reasonable time and, with limited exceptions, no more than one year after entry of judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court opinion; nonprecedential except as permitted by applicable law.
PARTIES	Christopher W. Castle v. St. Charles Health System, Inc.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- summary judgment
- discovery dispute
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

health law

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration was timely under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(c) (1).
2. Whether Plaintiff's asserted error concerning the date and cause of his technical difficulties established newly discovered evidence, clear error, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law sufficient to warrant reconsideration.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for reconsideration was untimely because it was filed more than one year after entry of the judgment and was not filed within the applicable deadline.
2. Plaintiff's asserted error did not warrant reconsideration because he failed to present newly discovered evidence, demonstrate clear error or manifest injustice, or identify an intervening change in controlling law.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Reconsideration is an "extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.""

"In sum, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration because it is untimely and, independently, because Plaintiff failed to present newly discovered evidence, show that the Court had committed clear error, show that the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or show that there was an intervening change in controlling law."

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff asserted that an incorrect date in his prior motion to extend discovery caused the court to misunderstand the circumstances that prevented him from timely responding to Defendant's summary judgment motion. He attributed the delay to medical trauma, a tree striking his residence and disrupting internet connectivity, and changes to his phone number resulting in multi-factor-authentication lockouts. The judgment was entered on March 19, 2025; Plaintiff stated that he learned of it on November 25, 2025, but filed his reconsideration motion on March 23, 2026.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously granted summary judgment to St. Charles Health System, Inc. Plaintiff then moved for reconsideration, arguing that an error in a prior motion to extend discovery justified setting aside the judgment. The district court denied reconsideration because the motion was untimely and, independently, because Plaintiff did not establish a recognized basis for reconsideration.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Carroll v. Nakatani, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Dixon v. Wallowa County, 336 F.3d 1013, 1022 (9th Cir. 2003)
- Hernandez v. Jefferson County Sheriff's Office, Case No. 3:19-cv-1404-JR, 2021 WL 2349320, at *1 (D. Or. Feb. 1, 2021)
- Carter v. Beverly Hills Savings & Loan Ass'n, 884 F.2d 1186, 1189 (9th Cir. 1989)

OPINION

Castle

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

EUGENE DIVISION

CHRISTOPHER W. CASTLE, Civ. No. 6:23-cv-01217-AA Plaintiff, OPINION & ORDER vs.
ST. CHARLES HEALTH SYSTEM, INC.,

Defendant. _____ AIKEN, District Judge: Before the Court is self-represented Plaintiff Christopher W. Castle's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 30. Plaintiff seeks to set aside the Court's Order granting summary judgment to Defendant St. Charles Medical System, Inc. See Opinion & Order, ECF No. 27. For the reasons explained below, the Motion, ECF No. 30, is DENIED.

LEGAL STANDARD

Reconsideration is an "extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." Carroll v. Nakatani, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), a party may move to alter or amend a judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Courts have determined that reconsideration is "appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." Dixon v. Wallowa Cnty., 336 F.3d 1013, 1022 (9th Cir. 2003) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). "Motions for reconsideration are not the proper vehicles for rehashing old arguments and are not intended to give an unhappy litigant one additional chance to sway the judge." Hernandez v. Jefferson Cnty. Sheriff's Office, Case No. 3:19-cv-1404-JR, 2021 WL 2349320, at *1 (D. Or. Feb. 1, 2021) (cleaned up). In addition, 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." Carroll, 342 F.3d at 945.

DISCUSSION

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's motion and the attached declaration. Plaintiff contends that the Court should set aside the judgment for Defendant because Plaintiff made an error in his motion to extend the discovery deadline. Pl. Decl. at 2; see ECF No. 23. Plaintiff states that in his prior motion to extend discovery, he incorrectly stated that he suffered "certain technical failures . . . in 2021." Id. Plaintiff contends that his need to extend discovery resulted not from technical failures in 2021 but instead from (1) medical trauma from multiple dental extractions that occurred from May 18, 2023, to December 7, 2023, id. at 3; (2) "a major tree" that struck his residence on August 4, 2024, that "destroyed [his] internet connectivity," id.; and (3) a change in "[his] contact phone number and subsequent Multi-Factor Authentication (MFA) lockouts[.]" id. Plaintiff contends that "the multiple significant technical failures that materially affected [his] ability to prepare, organize, convert, and file documents required in this case" occurred in "2023 and continu[ed] through 2024, and 2025, and 2026." Id. Even assuming that Plaintiff provided the wrong date of his technical failures—the failures that purportedly explain why Plaintiff failed to timely respond to Defendant's summary judgment motion and instead filed a motion to extend discovery—such error would not have changed the Court's denial of Plaintiff's request to extend discovery. Plaintiff could have gone to a library to file his documents, and he had plenty of time to do so because the Court had repeatedly extended deadlines on his behalf. Plaintiff's "error" does not provide a proper ground for the extraordinary remedy of setting aside the Court's entry of judgment for Defendant. Further, the Motion for Reconsideration itself is untimely. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(c)(1) requires that motions for reconsideration be filed within a "reasonable time" and, with limited exception, "not more than a year after the entry of the judgment." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c)(1). The time starts to run on the "entry" of a final judgment. *Carter v. Beverly Hills Savings & Loan Ass'n*, 884 F.2d 1186, 1189 (9th Cir. 1989), cert. denied, 497 US 1024 (1990). The judgment Plaintiff seeks to set aside was entered March 19, 2025. Plaintiff filed this Motion on March 23, 2026—more than one year later. Plaintiff had until March 19, 2026, to file this Motion. Plaintiff again cites his multiple technical failures for the delay. Plaintiff admits that he discovered the Court's entry of judgment on November 25, 2025. Pl. Decl. at 2. He had several months—from November 25, 2025, to March 19, 2026—to file this Motion. In sum, the Court denies Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration because it is untimely and, independently, because Plaintiff failed to present newly discovered evidence, show that the Court had committed clear error, show that the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or show that there was an intervening change in controlling law.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons explained, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 30, is DENIED. It is so ORDERED and DATED this 29th day of May 2026. s/ Ann Aiken

ANN AIKEN

United States District Judge

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-oregon-united-states-district-court-for-the-district/2026/christopher-w-castle-v-st-charles-health-system-inc-sil6sogw>