

[Cite as *Portage Roofing, Inc. v. Mike Coates, Constr. Co., Inc.*, 2017-Ohio-7560.]

STATE OF OHIO, MAHONING COUNTY

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

SEVENTH DISTRICT

PORTAGE ROOFING, INC.	)	
	)	
Plaintiff-Appellant	)	
	)	
vs.	)	CASE NO. 15 MA 0175
	)	
MIKE COATES CONSTRUCTION CO.,	)	OPINION
INC., ET AL.	)	AND
	)	JUDGMENT ENTRY
Defendants-Appellees	)	
	)	

CHARACTER OF PROCEEDINGS: Motion for Reconsideration

JUDGMENT: Denied

APPEARANCES:

For Portage Roofing, Inc.  
- Appellant

Attorney Dean Hoover  
Hudson Station, Suite 3  
5 Atterbury Blvd.  
Hudson, Ohio 44236

For Mike Coates Construction Co.,  
Inc., Et. Al. - Appellees

Attorney Richard Goddard  
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP  
The Calfee Building  
1405 East Sixth Street  
Cleveland, OH 44114

JUDGES:

Hon. Mary DeGenaro  
Hon. Gene Donofrio  
Hon. Carol Ann Robb

Dated: September 7, 2017

[Cite as *Portage Roofing, Inc. v. Mike Coates, Constr. Co., Inc.*, 2017-Ohio-7560.]

PER CURIAM.

{¶1} Plaintiff-Appellant, Portage Roofing, Inc., filed an application for reconsideration of *Portage Roofing, Inc. v. Coates Construction, Inc.*, 7th Dist. No. 15 MA 0175, 2017–Ohio–5710.

{¶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." *Columbus v. Hodge*, 37 Ohio App.3d 68, 523 N.E.2d 515 (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).

{¶4} On reconsideration, Portage reiterates the same argument it made on direct appeal: that the jurisdictional priority rule precludes the Mahoning County court from exercising jurisdiction over Coates' claims. This is merely a disagreement with the decision reached by this Court. Portage does not call to our attention an obvious error in our opinion.

{¶5} Portage's arguments regarding the jurisdictional priority rule were fully considered by this Court prior to ruling on the matter. The motion for reconsideration

does not call to the attention of this Court an obvious error. Accordingly, Portage's motion for reconsideration is denied.

DeGenaro, J., concurs.

Donofrio, J., concurs.

Robb, P. J., concurs.