



The Court has not found, and in his letter to the Court Mr. Walsh does not identify, “controlling decisions or data that the [C]ourt overlooked” in its January 8, 2014 Decision and Order, as would warrant granting a motion for reconsideration. Hartford Fire Ins. Co. v. Expeditors Intern. of Washington, Inc., No. 10 Civ. 5643, 2012 WL 6200958, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 11, 2012) (quoting Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir.1995)). Specifically, Mr. Walsh has not identified any legal authority that would support the Court’s reversal of UBC General President Douglas McCarron's interpretation of the UBC Constitution. See United States v. Dist. Council of New York City, 972 F. Supp. 756, 760-61 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) (“The Consent Decree says nothing about the UBC's powers to act under its constitution, by-laws, and the Federal labor laws; nor was there a basis in law for doing so.”); U.S. v. District Council of New York City, No. 90 Civ. 5722, 2007 WL 2728984, at \*1 (S.D.N.Y. Sep[t]. 12, 2007) (“This Court's limited jurisdiction does not extend to adjudicating alleged violations of the UBC constitution. ”). Moreover, Mr. Walsh does not identify any provision in the June 2010 Stipulation and Order that would authorize, much less require, the RO to veto a decision by the UBC General President.

The Court, therefore, concludes that Mr. Walsh’s application for reconsideration should be denied. See Aczel v. Labonia, 584 F.3d 52, 61 (2d Cir. 2009) (motion for reconsideration “should be granted only in extraordinary circumstances” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Dated: New York, New York  
March 3, 2014

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
RICHARD M. BERMAN, U.S.D.J.