

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Fred Feleki Martinez v. Peterson

No. 2:21-cv-01779-DAD-JDP (PC) · No. No. 2:21-cv-01779-DAD-JDP (PC) · Decided October 2, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied plaintiff Fred Feleki Martinez’s motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment granting summary judgment to defendant Peterson. The court held that the motion merely rehashed previously rejected arguments, identified no new evidence or intervening change in law, and did not establish clear error; the plaintiff’s request for a ruling was also denied as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dale A. Drozd
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	October 2, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:21-cv-01779-DAD-JDP (PC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment entered after the court adopted a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and granted defendant's motion for summary judgment.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted based on newly discovered evidence, clear error or manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law. Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy used sparingly, and a motion may not be used to rehash arguments previously presented or to raise arguments or evidence that could have been presented before judgment.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; precedential status unknown
PARTIES	Fred Feleki Martinez v. Peterson

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

summary judgment

section 1983

prisoners rights

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff was entitled to relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) based on newly discovered evidence, clear error, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law.
2. Whether plaintiff's motion improperly rehashed arguments and evidence that had already been considered before entry of judgment.
3. Whether plaintiff's request for a ruling remained justiciable after adjudication of the Rule 59(e) motion.

HOLDINGS

1. A Rule 59(e) motion is not a vehicle for rehashing arguments previously presented or for raising arguments or evidence that could have been raised before judgment.
2. Plaintiff was not entitled to alter or amend the judgment because the motion identified no new evidence, presented no new argument, and did not show clear error, manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law.
3. Plaintiff's request for a ruling was denied as moot because the court resolved the pending Rule 59(e) motion.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted if '(1) the district court is presented with newly discovered evidence, (2) the district court committed clear error or made an initial decision that was manifestly unjust, or (3) there is an intervening change in controlling law.'" (at 1)

"Plaintiff's pending motion does not identify new evidence, present new argument, or support a finding that the court committed clear error in reaching this conclusion." (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brought a civil-rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 based on an alleged serious mental-health episode and self-inflicted physical injury on April 8, 2021. In granting summary judgment, the court relied on institutional and medical records that allegedly rendered plaintiff's account implausible and directly refuted it. Plaintiff's Rule 59(e) motion relied on explanations and materials previously presented concerning the absence of a work order for a broken light bulb and the absence of medical records documenting the alleged injury.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge recommended granting defendant's motion for summary judgment. After considering plaintiff's objections, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations, granted summary judgment,

entered judgment, and closed the case on March 28, 2025. Plaintiff then moved to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e); the court denied that motion and denied as moot plaintiff's request for a ruling.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- California Architectural Bldg. Prods., Inc. v. Franciscan Ceramics, Inc., 818 F.2d 1466, 1468 (9th Cir. 1987)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)
- Blue Ridge Ins. Co. v. Stanewich, 142 F.3d 1145, 1147 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Harper v. Wallingford, 877 F.2d 728, 731 (9th Cir. 1989)
- United States v. Navarro, 972 F. Supp. 1296, 1299 (E.D. Cal. 1997), rev'd on other grounds, 160 F.3d 1254 (9th Cir. 1998)
- Goodlow v. Camacho, No. 3:18-cv-0709-CAB-MDD, 2020 WL 6799381, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2020)
- United States v. Westlands Water Dist., 134 F. Supp. 2d 1111, 1131 (E.D. Cal. 2001)
- Costello v. U.S. Gov't, 765 F. Supp. 1003, 1009 (C.D. Cal. 1991)
- Ybarra v. McDaniell, 656 F.3d 984, 998 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Zimmerman v. City of Oakland, 255 F.3d 734, 737 (9th Cir. 2001)
- Tripathi v. Henman, 845 F.2d 205, 206 n.1 (9th Cir. 1988)
- McDowell v. Calderon, 197 F.3d 1253, 1254 n.1 (9th Cir. 1999)
- Fed. Hous. Fin. Agency v. Saticoy Bay, LLC, No. 2:16-cv-02242-JAD-BNW, 2025 WL 2624273, at *1 (D. Nev. Sept. 11, 2025)
- Witkin v. Wagner, No. 2:20-cv-00267-WBS-CKD (PC), 2022 WL 3371697, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2022)