

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

LYLE A. WILLIAMS,

Plaintiff,

v.

CASE NO. 11-15525

HON. LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF

THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN
MORTGAGE CORPORATION,

Defendant.

OPINION AND ORDER

AT A SESSION of said Court, held in the
United States Courthouse, in the City of Port Huron, State of
Michigan, on the 15th day of February, 2012.

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

I. INTRODUCTION

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's filing entered on the Court's docket on December 20, 2011, entitled "Illegal Foreclosure, Fraud, False Claim, Extortion Conspiracy Forgery Mail Fraud Theft by Deception Breach of Contract" (Docket #4). The Court had denied Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, abstained from exercising jurisdiction over Plaintiff's cause of action due to pending state court proceedings, and closed the case only a day earlier. As there is no pending action before the Court in regards to Plaintiff's cause of action, the Court shall treat the December 20, 2011, filing as a motion for reconsideration.

II. ANALYSIS

In order to obtain reconsideration of a particular matter, the party bringing the motion for reconsideration must: (1) file the motion for reconsideration within 10 days of the Court's prior ruling; (2) demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled, and (3) demonstrate that "correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case." E.D.

Mich. L.R. 7.1(h)(1) and (3). *See also Graham ex rel. Estate of Graham v. County of Washtenaw*, 358 F.3d 377, 385 (6th Cir. 2004); *Aetna Cas. and Sur. Co. v Dow Chemical Co.*, 44 F.Supp.2d 865, 866 (E.D. Mich. 1999); *Kirkpatrick v. General Electric*, 969 F.Supp. 457, 459 (E.D. Mich. 1997).

In this case, Plaintiff's motion was timely filed, however, the filing made by Plaintiff is a nearly verbatim recitation of pages 13-33 of his filing at Docket #1 of this case. There is no additional argument or authority, nor is there any specific request for relief in the present filing. Accordingly, the Court finds that there is no palpable defect by which the Court has been misled, nor is there any defect which could be corrected such that it would result in a different disposition of hte case.

Therefore, for the reasons stated, the Court shall deny Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, and for the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's filing/motion for reconsideration (Docket #4) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/Lawrence P. Zatkoff
LAWRENCE P. ZATKOFF
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: February 15, 2012

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of this Order was served upon the attorneys of record by electronic or U.S. mail on February 15, 2012.

S/Marie E. Verlinde
Case Manager
(810) 984-3290