

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MUELLER ET AL,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
TACO BELL CORP.,  
Defendant.


No. C02-05849 MJJ

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Before the Court is Defendant Taco Bell’s (“Defendant”) Motion for Reconsideration of the Court’s August 8, 2007 order granting in part Plaintiff’s motion for summary judgment. (Docket No. 319.) Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-9(b), the moving party must show the existence of a material difference in fact or law, the emergence of new material facts or a change of law, or a manifest failure by the Court to consider material facts or dispositive legal arguments presented to the Court. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-9(b). After careful review of Defendant’s Motion, Plaintiff’s Opposition, Defendant’s Reply and other relevant documents in the record, the Court finds that Defendants have not met their burden under Rule 7-9(b). The Court therefore **DENIES** Defendant’s Motion for Reconsideration.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: March 21, 2008

  
MARTIN J. JENKINS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE