

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Cause No. 1:07-cv-1167-WTL-DML
)	
THOMAS J. RITZ, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**ENTRY ON MOTION TO RECONSIDER AND
MOTION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT**

Before the Court is a Motion for Entry of Final Judgment (Docket No. 139) filed by the Government and a Motion for Reconsideration (Docket No. 144) filed by Defendant Ronald Ritz. Both motions are fully briefed, and the Court, being duly advised, now rules as follows.

I. MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Defendant Ronald Ritz¹ seeks reconsideration of the Court’s Entry on Remedy (Docket No. 138). Ronald argues that the imposed penalty is unduly harsh given the facts of this case. Having read Ronald’s brief, and the Government’s response thereto, the Court now **DENIES** Ronald’s motion. Ronald has not raised any argument that the Court did not consider in reaching its original decision, nor has he demonstrated to the Court that the original ruling was in error.

II. MOTION FOR ENTRY OF FINAL JUDGMENT

The Government filed a Motion for Entry of Final Judgment (Docket No. 139) against

¹ As the parties are aware, Ronald Ritz’s brother Thomas Ritz is a co-defendant in this lawsuit. For convenience, and to avoid any confusion, the Court will refer to Ronald Ritz as “Ronald” in this Entry.

Ronald. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) provides:

When an action presents more than one claim for relief . . . or when multiple parties are involved, the court may direct entry of final judgment as to one or more, but fewer than all, claims or parties only if the court expressly determines that there is no just reason for delay.

Pursuant to the Court's prior rulings, it appears that the only issues remaining in this lawsuit are whether Defendant Thomas Ritz is an owner or operator of a Public Water System, and, if so, what remedy is appropriate. The Court will be setting these issues for trial in the next sixty days by separate entry. The Government has not demonstrated any need for separate judgment to be entered now against Ronald given that the entire case will be resolved within the next few months, thus permitting a single judgment and the opportunity for a single appeal. Accordingly, the Government's motion is **DENIED**.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant Ronald Ritz's Motion to Reconsider (Docket No. 144) is **DENIED**. The Government's Motion for Entry of Final Judgment (Docket No. 139) is also **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED: 07/14/2011



Hon. William T. Lawrence, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Copies to all counsel of record via electronic notification.