

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MANI KESHTGARPOUR,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 17-cv-12917

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

HENRY FORD HEALTH SYSTEM, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING (1) PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION (ECF #24) AND (2) PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
AMEND/CORRECT (ECF #25)**

In this action, Plaintiff Mani Keshtgarpour, M.D., sought an order compelling Defendant Henry Ford Health System to issue him what Keshtgarpour called a “Certificate of Completion” related to a medical residency program that Keshtgarpour began in 2004. (*See* Compl., ECF #1 at Pg. ID 6.) Keshtgarpour also sought “Two Hundred Million U.S. Dollars” in money damages. (*Id.*) Henry Ford filed a motion to dismiss this action (*see* ECF ## 8, 10), the assigned Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation suggesting that the Court grant that motion (the “R&R”) (*see* ECF #17), and, on September 11, 2018, the Court granted Henry Ford’s motion over Keshtgarpour’s objections to the R&R. (*See* ECF #22.)

On September 19, 2019, Keshtgarpour filed two documents with the Court. (*See* ECF ## 24, 25.) Both appear to ask the Court to reconsider its September 11,

2018, ruling granting Henry Ford's motion and dismissing Keshtgarpour's Complaint. (*See id.*) Accordingly, the Court will construe both filings as motions to reconsider the Court's September 11, 2018, order.

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule 7.1(h). That rule provides:

Generally, and without restricting the Court's discretion, the Court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the Court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

E.D. Mich. Local Rule 7.1(h)(3).

The Court has reviewed Keshtgarpour's motions and concludes that he has not met this standard. Keshtgarpour has failed to persuade the Court that its September 11, 2018, order contains palpable defects, and Keshtgarpour has not shown that correction of any of the alleged defects would result in a different disposition of Henry Ford's motion to dismiss. Accordingly, Keshtgarpour's motions (ECF ## 24, 25) are **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 5, 2018

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on October 5, 2018, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda

Case Manager

(810) 341-9764