

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

| | | |
|-------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | CIVIL ACTION NO.: 2:16cv985-WHA |
| |) | (WO) |
| \$389,820.00 IN UNITED STATES |) | |
| CURRENCY, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

ORDER

This case is before the court on a Motion to Reconsider Order Determining In Rem Jurisdiction (Doc. # 38).

Consideration of a post-order motion to reconsider is left to the sound discretion of the district court. *Chapman v. Al Transport*, 229 F.3d 1012, 1023–24 (11th Cir. 2000). Motions for reconsideration generally serve a very narrow function: they are designed solely to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence that could not have been discovered at the time of the original motion. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 60. Because “litigants cannot be repeatedly called upon to backtrack through the paths of litigation,” reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly. *Sussman v. Salem, Saxon & Nielsen*, 153 F.R.D. 689, 694 (M.D. Fla. 1994).

After consideration of the arguments of Claimant, the court finds no reason to reconsider and it is hereby

Ordered that the Motion to Reconsider is DENIED.

Done this the 20th day of July, 2017.

/s/ W. Harold Albritton
W. HAROLD ALBRITTON
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE