IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Bahig Saliba,

Plaintiff,

v.

Allied Pilots Association,

Defendant.

No. CV-22-01025-PHX-DLR

ORDER

The Court dismissed this action on March 27, 2023. (Doc. 17.) Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of that order. (Doc. 18.)

Motions for reconsideration should be granted only in rare circumstances. Defenders of Wildlife v. Browner, 909 F. Supp. 1342, 1351 (D. Ariz. 1995). Mere disagreement with a previous order is an insufficient basis for reconsideration. See Leong v. Hilton Hotels Corp., 689 F. Supp. 1572, 1573 (D. Haw. 1988). "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." School Dist. No. 1J, Multnomah Cnty. v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). Such motions should not be used for the purpose of asking a court "to rethink what the court had already thought through—rightly or wrongly." Defenders of Wildlife, 909 F. Supp. at 1351 (quoting Above the Belt, Inc. v. Mel Bohannon Roofing, Inc., 99 F.R.D. 99, 101 (E.D. Va. 1983)).

Case 2:22-cv-01025-DLR Document 19 Filed 04/20/23 Page 2 of 2

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's motion and finds reconsideration is not warranted. Plaintiff does not identify any intervening change in controlling law, nor does he present any material information or argument that could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence. Instead, Plaintiff quarrels with the correctness of the Court's order and essentially asks that the Court re-think what it has already thought through. That is not the purpose of a motion for reconsideration.

IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 18) is DENIED. Dated this 20th day of April, 2023.