

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
MACON DIVISION**

TAMMY WELLS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-18 (MTT)
)	
GENERAL DYNAMICS INFORMATION)	
TECHNOLOGY, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

ORDER

Before the Court is the Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration. (Doc. 159). The Plaintiff moves the Court to reconsider its Order granting the Defendants’ Motion for an Extension of Time to file their Statements of Facts. (Doc. 155). For the following reasons, the Motion is **DENIED**.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6.¹ “Reconsideration is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” *Bingham v. Nelson*, 2010 WL 339806, at *1 (M.D. Ga. 2010) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate [her] prior arguments, and any

¹ This is the Plaintiff’s third Motion for Reconsideration filed in less than three months. See *also* (Docs. 145 and 150).

arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.”

McCoy v. Macon Water Authority, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

Further, “[t]he motion for reconsideration is not an opportunity for a party to improve upon [her] arguments or try out new arguments; nor is it properly a forum for a party to vent [her] dissatisfaction with the Court's reasoning. The Court assumes that in nearly every case at least one party will deem a decision to be based on flawed reasoning.”

Id. at 1223.

Here, the Plaintiff has not met her burden. She has alleged no intervening change in the law, has presented no new relevant evidence not previously available to the parties, and the Court is not persuaded its previous ruling was clearly erroneous.

Accordingly, the Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 22nd day of January, 2013.

S/ Marc T. Treadwell
MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT