

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

PAZUNIAK LAW OFFICE, LLC and)
GEORGE PAZUNIAK,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) C.A. No.: N14C-12-259 EMD
)
PI-NET INTERNATIONAL, INC. and)
LAKSHMI ARUNACHALAM,)
)
Defendants.)
)
)
)

**ORDER DENYING REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION OF ORDER
STRIKING PARAGRAPHS 3, 4(G), AND 4(H) FROM
PRO SE DEFENDANT AND COUNTER PLAINTIFF DR. LAKSHMI
ARUNACHALAM’S APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATION FOR
INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL UNDER RULE 42 OF THIS COURT’S ORDER OF
OCTOBER 20, 2016 DENYING DR. ARUNACHALAM’S MOTION TO
SUBSTITUTE**

Upon consideration of the Pro Se Defendant and Counter Plaintiff Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam’s Request for Re-Consideration of Order of November 4, 2016 Striking Paragraphs 3, 4(G) and 4(H) From Dr. Arunachalam’s Application for Certification for Interlocutory Appeal Under Rule 42 of this Court’s Order of October 20, 2016 Denying Dr. Arunachalam’s Motion to Substitute and Request for the Court to Rule Without a Hearing, as Dr. Arunachalam is Unable to Travel on November 14, 2016 due to a Car Accident and is Undergoing Medical Treatment (the “Request”), dated November 7, 2016, filed by Defendant Lakshmi Arunachalam; the Order Striking Paragraphs 3, 4(g) and 4(h) from *Pro Se* Defendant and Counter Plaintiff Dr. Lakshmi Arunachalam’s Application for Certification for Interlocutory Appeal Under Rule 42 of this Court’s Order of October 20, 2016 Denying Dr. Arunachalam’s Motion to Substitute (the

“Order”) entered by the Court on November 4, 2016; and good cause not having been shown for the relief sought in the Request,

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED that Superior Court Civil Rule 59(e) provides that a party may file a motion for reargument or reconsideration “within 5 days after the filing of the Court’s opinion or decision....;”¹

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED that a motion for reargument will be denied unless the Court has overlooked precedent or legal principle that would have controlling effect, or misapprehended the law or the facts such as would affect the outcome of the decision;²

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED that the Request was filed within 5 days after the filing of the Order; and

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED that the Request does not focus on the relevant legal issues decided by the Court with respect to substitution of Dr. Arunachalam for Pi-Net International Inc. and, instead, continues to address the purported conduct of Plaintiffs George Pazuniak and Pazuniak Law Office LLC; and

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED that the Request does not raise any viable precedent or legal principle overlooked by the Court in issuing and entering the Order; and

IT IS HEREBY FOUND AND DETERMINED that the Request does not show how the Court misapprehended the law or the facts such as would have affected the outcome reached in the Order; and

¹ Super. Ct. Civ. R. 59(e).

² *Woodward v. Farm Family Cas. Ins. Co.*, No. 00C-08-006, 2001 WL 1456865, at *1 (Del. Super. July 25, 2001).

IT IS ORDERED that the relief sought in the Request is **DENIED**.

Dated: November 9, 2016
Wilmington, Delaware

/s/ *Eric M. Davis*

Eric M. Davis
Judge, Superior Court