

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

<b>MICHAEL SANFORD,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:12-CV-306 (MTT)</b>
	)	
<b>ROBINS FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendant.</b>	)	
	)	

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court is pro se Plaintiff Michael Sanford's "Motion for Rule 60 Relief From Judgment." (Doc. 22). Sanford asks the Court to reconsider its November 20, 2012, Order that dismissed his case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. §§ 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6). (Doc. 20).

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. "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 [his] prior arguments, and any 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).

Here, the Plaintiff has not met his burden. He has not alleged an intervening change in the law nor presented new evidence previously not available to him, and the Court is not persuaded its previous ruling was clearly erroneous. Accordingly, the Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 7th day of December, 2012.

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