

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

SONDRA JOHNSON,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	NO. 02-CV-8508
JACQUES FERBER, INC., ET AL.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Baylson, J.

July 8, 2004

Presently before the Court are Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration-Rehearing (Docket No. 70) and Plaintiff's Sworn Declaration (Docket No. 71), which Plaintiff filed on June 14, 2004. Through the pending Motion, Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its Memorandum and Order of May 18, 2004 (which granted the dispositive motions of the two remaining defendants). On May 27, 2004, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Rehearing (Docket No. 68), which the Court denied on June 3, 2004 (Docket No. 69). For the reasons which follow, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration-Rehearing is DENIED.

Through her original and amended complaints, Plaintiff brought numerous claims, both state and federal, against several defendants. Over a series of opinions, the Court dismissed all claims against all parties. Johnson v. Jacques Ferber, Inc., No. 02-CV-8508, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9285 (E.D. Pa. May 19, 2004); Johnson v. Jacques Ferber, Inc., No. 02-CV-8508, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 22191 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 28, 2003); Johnson v. Jacques Ferber, Inc., No. 02-CV-8508, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19589 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 15, 2003), as to which Order Plaintiff filed a

Motion for Rehearing on October 27, 2003 (Docket No. 40), which the Court denied on November 25, 2003 (Docket No. 43).

The purpose of a Motion for Reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence. Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) cert. denied, 476 U.S. 1171, 106 S. Ct. 2895, 90 L. Ed. 2d 982 (1986); see also Alexander v. Nat'l Fire Ins. of Hartford, No. 03-1511, 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 9793 (E.D. Pa. May 5, 2004) (Baylson, J.). A court should grant a motion for reconsideration only “if the moving party establishes one of three grounds: (1) there is newly available evidence; (2) an intervening change in the controlling law; or (3) there is a need to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” Drake v. Steamfitters Local Union No. 420, No. 97-585, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13791, at *7-8 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 3, 1998). “Because federal courts have a strong interest in finality of judgments, motions for reconsideration should be granted sparingly.” Cont'l Cas. Co. v. Diversified Indus., Inc., 884 F. Supp. 937, 943 (E.D. Pa. 1995).

The Court concludes that there is no basis for Plaintiff's Motion. It does not: (1) demonstrate to the Court that there exists newly available evidence; (2) show an intervening change in the controlling law; or (3) illustrate a need to correct a clear error of law or to prevent a manifest injustice. Plaintiff recites the same arguments and conspiracy theories that have failed to persuade the Court on earlier occasions. “[A] motion for reargument should be denied where the proponent simply rehashes material and theories already briefed, argued, and decided.” TI Group Auto. Sys. v. VDO N. Am., L.L.C., No. 00-432-GMS, 2002 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1018, at *3 (D. Del. Jan. 22, 2002) (quotations omitted). See generally Quaker Alloy Casting Co. v. Gulfco Indus., Inc., 123 F.R.D. 282, 288 (N.D. Ill. 1988) (“This Court's opinions are not intended as

mere first drafts, subject to revision and reconsideration at a litigant's pleasure.”).

Accordingly, based on the foregoing, the Court affirms its holding in its Memorandum and Order dated May 18, 2004. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration-Rehearing (Docket No. 70) is DENIED.

BY THE COURT:

MICHAEL M. BAYLSON, U.S.D.J.

C:\inetpub\www\documents\opinions\source1\ASQ04D0199P.pae