

injustice.” Carmichael v. Everson, 2004 WL 1587894, at *1 (D.N.J. May 21, 2004). “Because reconsideration of a judgment after its entry is an extraordinary remedy, requests pursuant to these rules are to be granted ‘sparingly.’” NL Indus., Inc. v. Commercial Union Ins. Co., 935 F. Supp. 513, 516 (D.N.J. 1996) (citation omitted).

Plaintiff has not satisfied the high standard required to succeed on a motion for reconsideration. Indeed, Plaintiff has not presented any new factual evidence or legal authority. Plaintiff merely repeated the contentions that were proffered in his original Motion to Recuse. The Court considered these arguments and, after careful analysis, concluded that good cause existed for its ruling.

The Court, having considered the papers submitted pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 78 and, for the reasons set forth above;

IT IS this 2nd day of April, 2014,

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration of the Memorandum Opinion dated August 8, 2013 [dkt. no. 41] is **DENIED**.

s/ Douglas E. Arpert
DOUGLAS E. ARPert, U.S.M.J.