

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Robert Wooten v. Donald J. Trump

No. 2:25-cv-00873-DC-AC (PS) · No. No. 2:25-cv-00873-DC-AC (PS) · Decided January 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denies Robert Wooten’s motion for reconsideration of the court’s prior order adopting findings and recommendations and closing the case. The court concludes that the motion identifies no basis for reconsideration under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) or 60(b), and orders that the case remain closed.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dena Coggins
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	January 5, 2026
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-00873-DC-AC (PS)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of the court's prior order adopting the assigned magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and closing the case.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration is appropriate upon newly discovered evidence, clear error or manifest injustice, or an intervening change in controlling law; an untimely Rule 59(e) motion is treated as a Rule 60(b) motion and must be made within a reasonable time.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential unpublished district court order
PARTIES	Robert Wooten v. Donald J. Trump

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- federal civil litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's motion for reconsideration established a basis for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), Rule 60(b), or Local Rule 230(j).

HOLDINGS

1. The motion for reconsideration was properly denied because plaintiff identified no basis warranting reconsideration and merely reiterated his grievances against defendant.

KEY QUOTATIONS

- “Here, Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration does not identify any basis that warrants reconsideration of the court’s June 24, 2025 order. Rather, Plaintiff reiterates his grievances against Defendant Trump.”* (at 2)
- “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.”* (at 1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The case had been closed after the court adopted findings and recommendations in a June 24, 2025 order. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration did not identify newly discovered evidence, clear error, manifest injustice, an intervening change in controlling law, or other qualifying grounds. Instead, plaintiff reiterated grievances against defendant Donald J. Trump.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court entered an order on June 24, 2025, docketed June 25, 2025, adopting the assigned magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and closing the case. Plaintiff then moved for reconsideration under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), and the court denied the motion, leaving the case closed.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Bestran Corp. v. Eagle Comtronics, Inc.*, 720 F.2d 1019, 1019 (9th Cir. 1983)
- *Rishor v. Ferguson*, 822 F.3d 482, 490 (9th Cir. 2016)
- *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993)
- *Weeks v. Bayer*, 246 F.3d 1231, 1236 (9th Cir. 2001)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ROBERT WOOTEN, No. 2:25-cv-00873-DC-AC (PS) 12 Plaintiff, 13 v.
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION 14 DONALD J.

TRUMP, (Doc. No. 24) 15 Defendant. 16 17 This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the court's 18 June 24, 2025¹ order adopting the assigned magistrate judge's findings and recommendations and 19 closing this case.

(Doc. Nos. 17, 24.) 20 In his pending motion, Plaintiff invokes Rules 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil 21 Procedure, which applies after judgment has been entered and provides that "[a] motion to alter or 22 amend a judgment must be filed no later than 28 days after the entry of the judgment." Fed. R. 23 Civ. P. 59(e). "A timely filed motion for reconsideration under a local rule is a motion to alter or 24 amend a judgment under [Rule] 59(e)." *Bestran Corp. v. Eagle Comtronics, Inc.*, 720 F.2d 1019, 25 1019 (9th Cir.

1983). A motion for reconsideration filed outside that time period is treated as a 26 Rule 60(b) motion for relief from judgment or order, which "must be made within a reasonable 27 28 1 The court's June 24, 2025 order was entered on the docket on June 25, 2025. (Doc. No. 17.) 1 | time." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(c); *Rishor v. Ferguson*, 822 F.3d 482, 490 (9th Cir.

2016). 2 "Reconsideration is appropriate if the district court (1) is presented with newly discovered 3 | evidence, (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust, or (3) if there is 4 | an intervening change in controlling law." *Sch. Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty., Or. v. ACandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). A motion for reconsideration does not, however, give the 6 | moving party a "second bite at the apple." *Weeks v. Bayer*, 246 F.3d 1231, 1236 (9th Cir.

2001) 7 | (citation omitted). 8 In addition, Local Rule 230Q) requires, in relevant part, that in moving for reconsideration 9 | of an order denying or granting a prior motion, a party must show "what new or different facts or 10 | circumstances are claimed to exist which did not exist or were not shown" previously, "what 11 | other grounds exist for the motion," and "why the facts or circumstances were not shown" at the 12 | time the substance of the order which is objected to was considered.

L.R. 230(j). 13 Here, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration does not identify any basis that warrants 14 | reconsideration of the court's June 24, 2025 order. Rather, Plaintiff reiterates his grievances 15 | against Defendant Trump. (Doc. No. 24.)

Thus, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration will be 16 | denied. 17 Accordingly, 18 1. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. No. 24) is DENIED; and 19 2. This case shall remain closed. 20 IT IS SO ORDERED.: 29 | Dated: _December 31, 2025_ DUC Dena Coggins 23 United States District Judge 24 25 26 27 28