UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,	
V	Case No. 18-11559
RANDY J. CHAFFEE STATE OF MICHIGAN OTSEGO COUNTY,	Honorable Thomas L. Ludington
Defendants.	/

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

This matter is before the Court pursuant to Defendant Randy J. Chaffee's Motion for Reconsideration. ECF No. 59. On September 15, 2020, judgment was entered against Defendant Randy J. Chaffee in the amount of \$169,406.98, ECF No. 55, consistent with the Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment entered on March 31, 2020. ECF No. 46. Defendant now seeks reconsideration of this Court's order denying as moot Defendant's post-judgment motion to dismiss. ECF No. 57. As previously explained, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss was not only mooted by the Judgment but was his "third such motion since the case began—all of which recite[d] the meritless allegation that [Defendant's] residence is outside the United States of America." *Id.* at PageID.568.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7.1(h), a party may move for reconsideration of a prior order. A motion for reconsideration will be granted if the moving party shows "(1) a palpable defect, (2) the defect misled the court and the parties, and (3) that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." *Michigan Dept. of Treasury v. Michalec*, 181 F. Supp. 2d 731, 733–34 (E.D. Mich. 2002) (quoting E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(3)). Defendant identifies no palpable defect in

Case 1:18-cv-11559-TLL-PTM ECF No. 63, PageID.603 Filed 12/09/20 Page 2 of 2

this Court's order. Instead, he restates the same frivolous "sovereign citizen" rhetoric that this

Court has rejected repeatedly. See ECF No. 59 at PageID.582 ("Plaintiff has not provided any

evidence that . . . this court of limited jurisdiction has gained personam jurisdiction over the

[Defendant]."). Simply put, "an individual's belief that her status as a 'sovereign citizen' puts her

beyond the jurisdiction of the courts has no conceivable validity in American law." Charlotte v.

Hansen, 433 F. App'x 660, 661 (10th Cir. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Defendant Randy J. Chaffee's Motion for

Reconsideration, ECF No. 59, is **DENIED**.

Dated: December 9, 2020

s/Thomas L. Ludington THOMAS L. LUDINGTON United States District Judge

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney of record herein by electronic means and upon Randy J. Chaffee, at 1794 McGregor Road, Vanderbilt, MI 49795 first class U.S. mail on December 9, 2020.

s/Kelly Winslow
KELLY WINSLOW, Case Manager