

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>MAINE UNIFORM RENTAL, INC.</b>	)	
<b>D/B/A PRATT ABBOTT UNIFORM &amp;</b>	)	
<b>LINEN,</b>	)	
<b>INTERVENOR PLAINTIFF</b>	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL No. 2:15-cv-442-DBH</b>
	)	
<b>M/V NOVA STAR, <i>in rem</i>,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>DEFENDANT</b>	)	

**ORDER ON INTERVENOR PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR ADDITIONAL FINDINGS**

The motion of intervening plaintiff Maine Uniform Rental, Inc. d/b/a Pratt Abbott Uniform & Linen (“Pratt Abbott”) for additional findings under Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(b) is **DENIED**.

Rule 52(b)’s “purpose is to permit the correction of any manifest errors of law or fact that are discovered, upon reconsideration, by the trial court.” Nat’l Metal Finishing Co. v. BarclaysAmerican/Commercial, Inc., 899 F.2d 119, 123 (1st Cir. 1990). Pratt Abbott’s proposed additional findings are not pertinent to my findings of fact and conclusions of law arising out of the underlying bench trial, and Pratt Abbott has not suggested how they are pertinent. See, e.g., Lyons v. Jefferson Bank & Trust, 793 F. Supp. 989, 991 (D. Colo. 1992) (declining to supplement findings that are not essential to disposition of the case). They are also largely in dispute. (If any of them were material to the outcome, then I would resolve the dispute.)

**SO ORDERED.**

**DATED THIS 7<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2016**

/s/D. Brock Hornby  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
**D. BROCK HORNBY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**