

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 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OF THE COURT'S ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S FIRST MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION (ECF #30)**

By order dated September 11, 2018, this Court dismissed Plaintiff Mani Keshtgarpour, M.D.'s Complaint on the ground that his claims were barred by the applicable statutes of limitations (the "Dismissal Order"). (*See* Dismissal Order, ECF #22.) Keshtgarpour thereafter moved for reconsideration of the Dismissal Order (*see* First Mot. for Reconsideration, ECF #29), and the Court denied relief in a written order dated November 30, 2018. (*See* Order Denying Mot. for Reconsideration, ECF #30.) On December 13, 2018, Keshtgarpour filed a motion for reconsideration of the Court's November 30 order denying his first motion for reconsideration. (*See* Second Mot. for Reconsideration, ECF #31.) Keshtgarpour's second motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

Motions for reconsideration in this Court are governed by Local Rule 7.1(h). Under that rule, “[a] motion for rehearing or reconsideration must be filed within 14 days after entry of the judgment or order.” E.D. Mich. Local Rule 7.1(h)(1). In addition:

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 carefully reviewed Keshtgarpour’s second motion for reconsideration and concludes that he is not entitled to relief. None of the arguments raised in the motion persuade the Court that it palpably erred when it denied Keshtgarpour’s first motion for reconsideration. Nor has Keshtgarpour shown that even if such a defect existed, it would have resulted in a different disposition of the case. Accordingly, Keshtgarpour has not established an entitlement to relief under Local Rule 7.1(h). **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Keshtgarpour’s second motion for reconsideration (ECF #30) is **DENIED**.

Dated: December 17, 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 December 17, 2018, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda

Case Manager

(810) 341-9764