

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

THE FASHION EXCHANGE,

Plaintiff,

v.

HYBRID PROMOTIONS et al.,

Defendants.

14-CV-1254 (SHS)

ORDER


SIDNEY H. STEIN, U.S. District Judge.

Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of this Court's ruling on plaintiff's prior motion for reconsideration of this Court's ruling granting defendants' motion for partial summary judgment, (ECF No. 466), is denied. Plaintiff has offered no new evidence, changes in the law, or clear error warranting reconsideration. The Court considered all of the matters set forth in this repetitious reconsideration motion when it denied plaintiff's previous motion for reconsideration two weeks ago. (ECF No. 455.) The basis of plaintiff's motion is that it is entitled to have the Court explicitly address in its decision every sentence and every footnote in plaintiff's submissions. Plaintiff is incorrect. The Court's decisions have decided the issues raised in the supporting and opposing submissions. Plaintiff is not entitled to an explicit recitation of the Court's view of every detail raised in its voluminous filings. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(3); *In re Beacon Assocs. Litig.*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 697, 703 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) ("An absence of justification is not the same thing . . . as the presence of error or likelihood of injustice a party moving for reconsideration must demonstrate to prevail in the Second Circuit.").

The Court cautions Mr. Zarin that he is at risk of being sanctioned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927 if he continues to "multipl[y] the proceedings . . . unreasonably and vexatiously" in this manner. This is not his first warning. *See* ECF No. 307 (after magistrate judge ruled on motion that plaintiff insisted was only a letter, magistrate permitted a motion for reconsideration of its ruling, noting that "[i]f Plaintiff's motion only repeats the arguments in its prior letter, ECF 290, or if the Court finds Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is not substantially justified, the Court will consider awarding or apportioning reasonable expenses under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37(a)(5) (A)-(C)."); *see also* ECF No. 333 (plaintiff's counsel sanctioned by magistrate for obstructing deposition); ECF No. 348 (plaintiff and plaintiff's counsel sanctioned by magistrate for failure to preserve electronically stored information).

Dated: New York, New York
February 8, 2023

SO ORDERED.


Sidney H. Stein, U.S.D.J.