



not addressed by Plaintiff on reply. *See* Dkt. No. 129 at 2 (noting Plaintiff fails to explain “how expanding his standing will impact his damages, his causation issues, or Defendants’ affirmative defenses.”); *id.* at 12 (noting that no claims are pursued on behalf of individuals or entities other than CARRG); *id.* at 13-15 (raising additional concerns arguably presented by the proposed expansion of standing).

Wherefore, Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider is denied without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Cameron McGowan Currie  
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Columbia, South Carolina  
January 6, 2011