

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA  
Civil No. 15-4436(DSD/SER)

Troy K. Scheffler,  
Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER**

Gurstel Chargo, P.A.  
Defendant.

Peter J. Nickitas, Esq., 431 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 2446,  
Minneapolis, MN 55415, counsel for plaintiff.

Manuel H. Newburger, Esq. and Barron & Newburger, PC, 1212  
Guadalupe, Suite 104, Austin, TX 78701 and Amy M. Goltz, Esq.  
and Gurstel Chargo, P.A., 6681 Country Club Drive, Golden  
Valley, MN 55427, counsel for defendant.

This matter is before the court upon the request by defendant  
Gurstel Chargo, P.A. to file a motion to reconsider the court's  
denial of its motion for sanctions. See ECF No. 116.

Motions to reconsider require the express permission of the  
court and will be granted only upon a showing of "compelling  
circumstances." D. Minn. LR 7.1(j). A motion to reconsider should  
not be employed to relitigate old issues but rather to "afford an  
opportunity for relief in extraordinary circumstances." Dale &  
Selby Superette & Deli v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., 838 F. Supp. 1346,  
1348 (D. Minn. 1993).

The court has reviewed Gurstel's request and finds that no  
extraordinary circumstances exist that warrant reconsideration of  
the court's prior ruling.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. The request to withdraw the motion for reconsideration as filed in error is granted;

2. The motion for reconsideration [ECF No. 118] shall be stricken from the docket; and

3. The letter request for permission to file a motion to reconsider [ECF No. 120] is denied.

Dated: August 14, 2017

s/David S. Doty  
David S. Doty, Judge  
United States District Court