

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
EASTERN DIVISION

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE	)	
COMPANY,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:15CV1430 HEA
	)	
DEBORAH REDAVIDE, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Deborah Redavide’s Motion for Reconsideration, [Doc. No. 27]. For the reasons set forth below, the Motion is denied.

On May 15, 2017, the Court entered its Opinion, Memorandum and Order finding that Bryan K. Reeves was entitled to the proceeds of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Policy. Redavide now seeks to have the Court reconsider the Order.

“Rule 59(e) permits a court to alter or amend a judgment, but it ‘may not be used to relitigate old matters, or to raise arguments or present evidence that could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment.’ 11 C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 2810.1, pp. 127-128 (2d ed.1995) (footnotes omitted).” *Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker*, 554 U.S. 471, 128 S.Ct. 2605, 2617, n. 5 (2008). Rule 59(e) was adopted to clarify that “the district court possesses the power to

rectify its own mistakes in the period immediately following the entry of judgment.” *White v. New Hampshire Dep t of Employment Sec.*, 455 U.S. 445, 450, 102 S.Ct. 1162, 71 L.Ed.2d 325 (1982) (internal quotations omitted). Moreover, “Rule 59(e) motions serve the limited function of correcting manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Innovative Home Health Care, Inc. v. P.T .-O.T. Assocs. of the Black Hills*, 141 F.3d 1284, 1286 (8th Cir.1998),(internal punctuation and citations omitted). “Such motions cannot be used to introduce new evidence, tender new legal theories, or raise arguments which could have been offered or raised prior to entry of judgment.” *United States v. Metropolitan St. Louis Sewer Dist.*, 440 F.3d 930, 933 (8th Cir.2006) (quoting *Innovative Home Health Care*, 141 F.3d at 1286)).

District courts “will ordinarily deny a motion for reconsideration unless the party demonstrates a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or demonstrates new facts or legal authority that the party could not have previously produced with reasonable diligence to the court.” *Elder –Keep v. Aksamit*, 460 F.3d 979, 988 (8th Cir.2006); *Monsanto Co. v. E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co.*, 2011 WL 322672 at \*4 (E.D.Mo. Jan.31, 2011); *Arnold v. ADT Sec. Services, Inc.*, 627 F.3d 716, 721 (8th Cir.2010). A motion to reconsider “cannot be used to raise arguments which could have been raised prior to the issuance of judgment.” *Hagerman v. Yukon Energy*


Corp., 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir.1988). District courts have “broad discretion” in determining whether to reconsider judgment. Hagerman, 839 F.2d at 413.

In her Motion, Plaintiff attempts to persuade the Court to grant relief from its findings which led to the conclusion that she was not entitled to the proceeds of the policy. Plaintiff has not produced evidence, but has merely argued that the decision should not stand. Plaintiff has presented nothing new, nor has she pointed the Court to any mistake so severe as to establish manifest error. Nothing has been presented to the Court which would establish that Redavide is the rightful beneficiary to the insurance policy. The judgment in this matter shall remain.

Accordingly,

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Deborah Redavide’s Motion to Reconsider [Doc. No. 27], is denied.

Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2017.



---

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE