

the Final Approval Order was vacated and remanded, is necessary to prevent a manifest injustice to the class and class counsel. Specifically, the Court’s decision precludes their recovery of any damages or compensation, respectively, from this litigation.

“A district court may grant a motion for reconsideration under Rule 59(e) only if the movant presents newly discovered evidence or demonstrates ‘manifest errors of law or fact’ in the challenged ruling.” Giddens v. Lawson, 839 Fed. Appx. 350 (11th Cir. 2020) (quoting Arthur v. King, 500 F.3d 1335, 1343 (11th Cir. 2007)). While Plaintiffs argue that the Court committed manifest error, the arguments as to why and how the Court erred are substantially the same as those previously before the Court and heard on January 31, 2025. Since a “Rule 59(e) motion [cannot be used] to relitigate old matters...” Arthur, 500 F. 3d at 1343 (bracketed text in original) (citation omitted), Plaintiffs’ motion to reconsider is denied.

DONE and ORDERED this the 11th day of March 2025.

s/ Kristi K DuBose
KRISTI K. DuBOSE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE