| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Civil Division ROGER E. WEST (State Bar No. 58609) Assistant United States Attorney First Assistant Chief, Civil Division DAVID A. DeJUTE (State Bar No. 153527) Assistant United States Attorney | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| 10 | Attorneys for Defendants | | |
| 11 12 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 13 | SOUTHERN DIVISION | | |
| 14 | | | |
| 15 | CAPTAIN PAMELA BARNETT, et al., | (Anx) | |
| 16 | Plaintiffs, | OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR | |
| 17 | v. | RECONSIDERATION | |
| | BARACK H. OBAMA, et al. | | |
| 18 19 | Defendants. |) [NO HEARING DATE YET NOTICED BY) PLAINTIFF] | |
| | | | |
| 20 21 | | | |
| | | | |
| 22 23 | | | |
| 23 24 | | | |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| | | | |
| 28 | | | |

Defendants, by and through their undersigned counsel, hereby set forth their opposition to Plaintiffs' "Motion for Reconsideration of Order to Dismiss Under Rule 59E and Rule 60." Rule 7-18 of the Local Rules of the Central District of California provides as follows:

6 "Motion for Reconsideration. A motion for reconsideration of the decision on any motion 7 may be made only on the grounds of (a) a 8 9 material difference in fact or law from that presented to the Court before such decision 10 11 that in the exercise of reasonable diligence 12 could not have been known to the party moving 13 for reconsideration at the time of such 14 decision, or (b) the emergence of new material 15 facts or a change of law occurring after the time of such decision, or (c) a manifest 16 17 showing of a failure to consider material facts presented to the Court before such decision. 18 19 No motion for reconsideration shall in any manner repeat any oral or written argument made 20 21 in support of or in opposition to the original 22 motion."

Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration completely violates, both procedurally and substantively, the above-quoted Local Rule, and, accordingly, should be summarily denied.

Additionally, the Motion should be denied because it violates Local Rule 6-1, which requires that a Notice of Motion be filed, setting the matter for hearing no earlier than 21 days after

1

| 1 | filing. No such Notice of Motion has been served upon undersigned | |
|----------|---|--|
| 2 | counsel, and no such hearing date has been noticed. | |
| 3 | Finally, the Motion should be denied because it violates Local | |
| 4 | Rule 7-3, which requires that a conference of counsel take place | |
| 5 | prior to the filing of the Motion. No such conference took place | |
| 6 | in this case. | |
| 7 | For all of the foregoing reasons, the Motion should be denied. | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | Respectfully submitted, | |
| 10 | DATED: November 13, 2009 GEORGE S. CARDONA | |
| 11 | Acting United States Attorney LEON WEIDMAN | |
| 12 | Assistant United States Attorney Chief, Civil Division | |
| 13 | /s/ Roger E. West | |
| 14 | ROGER E. WEST Assistant United States Attorney | |
| 15 | First Assistant Chief, Civil Division | |
| 16 | <u>/s/ David A. DeJute</u> DAVID A. DEJUTE | |
| 17 | Assistant United States Attorney | |
| 18 | Attorneys for Defendants | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 25 | | |
| 25 26 | | |
| 26 27 | | |
| 27 28 | | |
| 20 | | |
| | 2 | |