

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

ANDRE PEASE

v.

Case No.: 8:02-cv-1830-T-24
8:98-cr-302-T-24

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ORDER

This cause comes before the Court on Petitioner Andre Pease's motion for reconsideration of the Court's July 31, 2006 denial of his motion filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. (Civ. Dkt. 27). The Court, having reviewed the motion for reconsideration and being otherwise advised, concludes that the motion should be denied.

There are three major grounds justifying reconsideration: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; and (3) the need to correct clear error or to prevent manifest injustice. *Sussman v. Salem, Saxon & Nielsen, P.A.*, 153 F.R.D. 689, 694 (M.D. Fla. 1994) (citations omitted). Reconsideration, or rehearing, is "an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of scarce judicial resources." *Int'l Union of Painters v. Argyros*, No. 05-1661, 2007 WL 1577840, at *1 (M.D. Fla. May 31, 2007) (citations and quotations omitted).

In his motion for reconsideration, Petitioner argues that the Court should take into consideration his ineffective assistance of counsel argument, which Petitioner claims he could not raise earlier due to the terms of his plea agreement.

Petitioner has not shown that any of the three major grounds justifying reconsideration apply in this case. As such, relief is not warranted, and Petitioner's motion must be denied. Accordingly, it is **ORDERED AND ADJUDGED** that Petitioner's motion for reconsideration (Dkt. 27) is **DENIED**.

DONE AND ORDERED at Tampa, Florida, this 22nd day of September, 2015.


SUSAN C. BUCKLEW
United States District Judge

Copies to:
Counsel of Record
Pro Se Petitioner