

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
FORT MYERS DIVISION

JOSEPH M. VERRIER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 2:14-cv-744-FtM-29CM

PETER PERRINO and DIANE
LAPPAUL,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court upon review of Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (Doc. 144) filed on October 16, 2017, construed as a Motion for Reconsideration of the Order (Doc. 143). Plaintiff seeks to supplement the information and documents missing from his previous motions to compel, which the Court denied for the reasons enumerated in the Order (Doc. 143). Doc. 144. Based on his newly supplemented information, Plaintiff seeks the Court to reconsider its previous Order. *Id.* Defendants oppose the requested relief. Doc. 145.

“Reconsideration of a court’s previous order is an extraordinary remedy and, thus, is a power which should be used sparingly.” *Carter v. Premier Rest. Mgmt.*, No. 2:06-CV-212-FTM-99DNF, 2006 WL 2620302, at *1 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 13, 2006) (citing *Am. Ass’n of People with Disabilities v. Hood*, 278 F. Supp. 2d 1337, 1339 (M.D. Fla. 2003)). “A motion for reconsideration should raise new issues, not merely readdress issues litigated previously,” *Paine Webber Income Props. Three Ltd. P’ship v. Mobil Oil Corp.*, 902 F. Supp. 1514, 1521 (M.D. Fla. 1995), and must “set forth facts

or law of a strongly convincing nature to demonstrate to the court the reason to reverse its prior decision.” *Carter*, 2006 WL 2620302, at *1 (citing *Taylor Woodrow Constr. Corp. v. Sarasota/Manatee Auth.*, 814 F. Supp. 1072, 1072-73 (M.D. Fla. 1993)). Accordingly, the Court will deny Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration because Plaintiff does not set forth any proper grounds for the Court’s reconsideration of the Order (Doc. 143). Doc. 144; *see id.*

The Court further reminds Plaintiff that the discovery deadline in this case had expired on September 18, 2017. Doc. 56 at 1. The Case Management and Scheduling Order clearly states, “[t]he Court may deny as untimely all motions to compel filed after the discovery deadline.” *Id.* at 2. Thus, the Court will deny Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration to the extent that it seeks to compel Defendants to produce discovery because this motion is untimely. Doc. 144; *see id.*

ACCORDINGLY, it is hereby

ORDERED:

Plaintiff’s Motion to Compel (Doc. 144), construed as a Motion for Reconsideration of the Order (Doc. 143), is **DENIED**.

DONE and **ORDERED** in Fort Myers, Florida on this 30th day of October, 2017.


CAROL MIRANDO
United States Magistrate Judge

Copies:
Counsel of record

Unrepresented parties