

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

PAUL E. BRADLEY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**JP MORGAN CHASE BANK NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION, et al.,**

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:13-CV-180 (MTT)

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the Plaintiffs' motion. (Doc. 28). The motion is styled as an objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Because this case was not referred to a magistrate judge, the Court construes the motion as a motion for reconsideration. 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.) (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 Auth.*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1223 (M.D. Ga. 1997).

To the extent the motion urges the Court to reconsider its September 18th Order (Doc. 22) granting the Defendants' motions to dismiss, it is untimely because it was filed more than 14 days after entry of the Court's Order.¹ See M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.6. To the extent the motion urges the Court to reconsider its November 12th Order (Doc. 27) denying the Plaintiffs' Rule 60 motion for relief from judgment, the Plaintiffs have not met their burden. They have not shown an intervening change in the law, that new evidence was discovered which was previously unavailable, or that the Court made a clear error of law. Consequently, the Plaintiffs' motion (Doc. 28) is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 10th day of December, 2013.

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

¹ The Plaintiffs filed their motion on November 22nd.