

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ABDIQAFAR WAGAFE, *et al.*, on behalf of
themselves and others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD TRUMP, President of the United
States, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:17-cv-00094-RAJ

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION
TO RECONSIDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendants’ Motion to Reconsider (Dkt. # 454) and Defendants’ corresponding motion to seal (Dkt. # 455).

As an initial matter, the Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ motion to seal (Dkt. # 455), finding good cause and finding compliance with the Local Rules.

Motions for reconsideration are “disfavored” and “ordinarily den[ied]” absent a showing of “manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or legal authority which could not have been brought to [the Court’s] attention earlier with reasonable diligence.” Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 7(h)(1). Defendants ask the Court to reconsider its previous *in camera* review order. Dkt. # 454 at 4. Specifically, they ask the Court “to reconsider portions of [its] order overruling certain redactions.” *Id.*

1 Because the Court already explained the history and scope of its *in camera* review, the
2 Court need not repeat that account here. Dkt. # 451.

3 During the Court’s *in camera* review, for some proposed redactions, “the Court
4 could not see the information under a redaction, or a portion of a redaction, and thus
5 made ‘no ruling on’ those redactions.” Dkt. # 454 at 2. Since then, however,
6 “Defendants [have] contacted Court staff and explained how the Court could access and
7 view” that information. *Id.* The Court finds that this new information constitutes “new
8 facts” under Local Rule 7(h)(1) and will indeed take this opportunity to reconsider.

9 In their motion, Defendants identify specific redactions—covering a specific page
10 range of a specific file—that the Court previously overruled. Dkt. # 454 at 3 (lines 12
11 through 14); *cf.* Dkt. # 451-1 at 5-6. Given the new information provided to the Court,
12 they ask the Court to reconsider and to “sustain all of Defendants’ redactions on these
13 pages.” *Id.* Upon reconsideration, for the reasons provided in Defendants’ motion, the
14 Court **GRANTS** Defendants’ request. The redactions identified above, previously
15 overruled, are no longer so. They are hereby **SUSTAINED**. In a manner consistent with
16 this order, Defendants shall apply the Court’s ruling to its larger document production.

17 For the reasons above, the Defendants’ Motion to Reconsider (Dkt. # 454) and
18 Defendants’ corresponding motion to seal (Dkt. # 455) are **GRANTED**.

19
20 DATED this 26th day of February, 2021.

21
22 

23 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
24 United States District Judge