

[Cite as *Cochran v. Presbyterian Church of Bloomingdale*, 2016-Ohio-8551.]

STATE OF OHIO, JEFFERSON COUNTY
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
SEVENTH DISTRICT

LESLIE COCHRAN, et al.)	
)	
PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS)	
)	
V.)	CASE NO. 15 JE 0011
)	
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF)	OPINION
BLOOMINGDALE, et al.)	AND
)	JUDGMENT ENTRY
DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES)	

CHARACTER OF PROCEEDINGS: Motion for Reconsideration

JUDGMENT: Denied.

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs-Appellants

Attorney James A. Villanova
Villanova Law Offices
16 Chatham Square
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

For Defendants-Appellees

Attorney Gregory A. Beck
Attorney Tonya J. Rogers
Baker, Dublikar, Beck, Wiley & Matthews
400 South Main Street
North Canton, Ohio 44720

JUDGES:

Hon. Mary DeGenaro
Hon. Gene Donofrio
Hon. Cheryl L. Waite

Dated: December 27, 2016

[Cite as *Cochran v. Presbyterian Church of Bloomingdale*, 2016-Ohio-8551.]
PER CURIAM.

{¶1} Leslie Cochran, et al., Plaintiffs–Appellants, filed a motion for reconsideration in the appeal of *Cochran, et al., v. Presbyterian Church of Bloomingdale*, 7th Dist. No. 15 JE 0111, 2016–Ohio–7020.

{¶2} “The test generally applied upon the filing of a motion for reconsideration in the court of appeals is whether the motion calls to the attention of the court an obvious error in its decision, or raises an issue for consideration that was either not considered at all or was not fully considered by the court when it should have been.” *City of Columbus v. Hodge*, 37 Ohio App.3d 68, 523 N.E.2d 515 (10th Dist.1987), paragraph one of the syllabus.

{¶3} The purpose of reconsideration is not to reargue one's appeal based on dissatisfaction with the logic used and conclusions reached by an appellate court. *Victory White Metal Co. v. N.P. Motel Syst. Inc.*, 7th Dist. No. 04 MA 0245, 2005–Ohio–3828, ¶ 2. “An application for reconsideration may not be filed simply on the basis that a party disagrees with the prior appellate court decision.” *Hampton v. Ahmed*, 7th Dist. No. 02 BE 0066, 2005–Ohio–1766, ¶ 16 (internal citation omitted). Nor is it “a mechanism to raise an entirely new argument and issue to the appellate court that was not raised in the appellate brief.” *State v. Wellington*, 7th Dist. No. 14 MA 0115, 2015–Ohio–2095, ¶ 9.

{¶4} In support of reconsideration, the Cochrans argue that this Court failed to consider the evidence regarding the location of the headstone and the testimony of Robert T. Stevens. This Court fully considered the entire trial record when deciding this appeal. The Cochrans do not call to our attention an obvious error, but merely proffer a disagreement with the format of the opinion and decision reached by the Court. Accordingly, the Cochrans' motion for reconsideration is denied.

DeGenaro, J., concurs.

Donofrio, P.J., concurs.

Waite, J., concurs.