UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

IN RE: NEELAM TANEJA

17-cv-9429 (JGK)

MEMORANDUM OPINION & ORDER

JOHN G. KOELTL, District Judge:

The pro se debtor, Neelam Taneja, moves for a rehearing, alleging that the Court overlooked documents filed on the docket, and that this Court's October 15, 2018, Memorandum Opinion and Order contradicts previous determinations of this Court.

The Court construes Taneja's motion as a motion for reconsideration. Reconsideration of a previous Opinion of the Court is an "extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of scarce judicial resources." In re Beacon Assocs. Litig., 818 F. Supp. 2d 697, 701 (S.D.N.Y. 2011) (internal quotation marks omitted). To succeed on a motion for reconsideration, the movant carries a heavy burden. The movant must show "an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice." Doe v. N.Y.C. Dept. of Soc. Servs., 709 F.2d 782, 789 (2d Cir. 1983). "The decision to grant or deny a motion for reconsideration

rests within the sound discretion of the district court." Vincent v. Money Store, No. 03cv2876, 2014 WL 1673375, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. April 28, 2014) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also In re Application of Furstenberg Fin. SAS, No. 18mc44, 2018 WL 4625802, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 26, 2018).

Contrary to Taneja's assertions, the Court did not overlook documents filed on the docket, and the Court's October 15, 2018, Memorandum Opinion and Order does not contradict prior Opinions issued in this case. Taneja has not shown "an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice." Doe v. N.Y.C. Dept. of Soc. Servs., 709 F.2d at 789. Therefore, Taneja has not met the heavy burden required to succeed on a motion for reconsideration. Accordingly, the motion for reconsideration is **denied**. The Clerk is directed to close the motion at Docket Number 29 and to close this case.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: **New York, New York**
October 31, 2018

John G. Koeltl
United States District Judge