

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION**

AMORITA N. THOMAS, on behalf of)	
herself and all others similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 1:08-cv-0667-DFH-DML
)	
H&R BLOCK EASTERN ENTERPRISES,)	
INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ENTRY


The court granted summary judgment to defendant and entered final judgment on August 28, 2009. On September 14, 2009, plaintiff filed a motion to reconsider. Under the counting rules that applied before December 1, 2009, plaintiff filed her motion on the tenth business day after judgment was entered, so her motion is treated as one under Rule 59(e). See, *e.g.*, *Romo v. Gulf Stream Coach, Inc.*, 250 F.3d 1119, 1121 n.3 (7th Cir. 2001).

A Rule 59(e) motion is not an occasion to present new arguments or evidence. See, *e.g.*, *Caisse Nationale de Credit Agricole v. CBI Industries, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1264, 1270 (7th Cir. 1996); *Fast Tek Group, LLC v. Plastech Engineered Products, Inc.*, 2006 WL 3409171, at *6 (S.D. Ind. Nov. 27, 2006). The court believes that it addressed plaintiff's original arguments and evidence adequately

in the original decision. The merits are fairly debatable, but further debate in this court on this issue of Indiana law will not serve any useful purpose. Plaintiff's motion to reconsider is hereby denied.

So ordered.

Date: January 26, 2010



DAVID F. HAMILTON, CIRCUIT JUDGE*
***sitting by designation**

Copies to:

**R. Anthony Costello
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS, LLP
tony.costello@huschblackwell.com**

**David D. Robinson
SCOPELITIS GARVIN LIGHT & HANSON
drobinson@scopelitis.com,bleive@scopelitis.com**

**Julianne P. Story
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS, LLP
julianne.popperstory@huschblackwell.com,kristine.hoernemann@huschblackwell.com**

**Ronald E. Weldy
WELDY & ASSOCIATES
weldy@weldylaw.com**

**Paul F. Pautler, Jr.
HUSCH BLACKWELL SANDERS, LLP
4801 Main Street
Suite 1000
Kansas City, MO 64112**