

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

HENRY MOUNSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT E. WALKER, JR. *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 08-cv-760-JPG-PMF

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff Henry Mounson's petition for rehearing (Doc. 182), which the Court construes as a motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). It is well settled that Rule 60(b) relief is an extraordinary remedy and is granted only in exceptional circumstances. *McCormick v. City of Chicago*, 230 F.3d 319, 327 (7th Cir. 2000) (citing *Dickerson v. Board of Educ.*, 32 F.3d 1114, 1116 (7th Cir. 1994)). Rule 60(b) allows a court "to address mistakes attributable to special circumstances and not merely to erroneous applications of law." *Russell v. Delco Remy Div. of General Motors Corp.*, 51 F.3d 746, 749 (7th Cir. 1995). The rule authorizes a Court to grant relief from judgment for the specific reasons listed in the rule but does not authorize action in response to general pleas for relief. *See Young v. Murphy*, 161 F.R.D. 61, 62 (N.D. Ill. 1995). It is also not an appropriate vehicle for addressing simple legal error, for rehashing old arguments, or for presenting arguments that should have been raised before the Court made its decision. *Russell*, 51 F.3d at 749; *Rutledge v. United States*, 230 F.3d 1041, 1052 (7th Cir. 2000); *Young*, 161 F.R.D. at 62; *In re Oil Spill by "Amoco Cadiz,"* 794 F. Supp. 261, 267 (N.D. Ill. 1992), *aff'd*, 4 F.3d 997 (7th Cir. 1993) (Table). Mounson has not provided any grounds justifying relief from judgment under Rule 60(b). Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** his motion (Doc. 182).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.****DATED: January 9, 2012**

s/ J. Phil Gilbert  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**J. PHIL GILBERT**  
**DISTRICT JUDGE**