

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

VISION BANK,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	CIVIL ACTION NO.: 10-00521-KD-B
)	
145, LLC, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Rule 59(e) Motion to Reconsider (Doc. 180) the March 1, 2012 striking of its Supplement (which requested attorneys’ fees and costs as to all five (5) defendants/counterclaimants) (Doc. 179).¹ Plaintiff’s Rule 59(e) motion has failed to set forth any basis for the relief requested.² Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider (Doc. 180) is **DENIED**. As previously ordered however, Plaintiff’s new Motion for Attorneys’ Fees and Costs *as to Defendant 145, LLC* shall be filed on or before **March 21, 2012**, and Defendant 145, LLC shall have until **March 28, 2012** within which to file any Response thereto.

DONE and ORDERED this the **9th** day of **March 2012**.

/s/ Kristi K. DuBose _____
KRISTI K. DUBOSE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ The original defendants/counterclaimants were 145, LLC, Scott D. Deichmann, James Dalton, Cynthia C. Kessler and David J. Lukinovich. All of the defendants except for 145 were dismissed with prejudice, each party to bear his, her or its own costs. (Docs. 157, 157-1, 158, 158-1, 160, 167, 168, 169, 171, 172, 174).

² See, e.g., Fetterhoff v. Liberty Life Assur. Co., 2007 WL 1713349, *1 (S.D. Ala. Jun. 11, 2007) (providing that a Rule 59(e) motion “must demonstrate why the court should reconsider its prior decision and ‘set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision[.]’”). See generally Shaarbay v. Florida, 269 Fed. Appx. 866 (11th Cir. 2008) (unpublished); Sonnier v. Computer Programs & Systems, Inc., 168 F. Supp. 2d 1322, 1336 (S.D. Ala. 2001).