



judgments, motions for reconsideration will be granted sparingly. Cont'l Casualty Co. v. Diversified Indus., Inc., 884 F. Supp. 937, 943 (E.D. Pa. 1995). A district court will grant a party's motion for reconsideration in only three situations: (1) the availability of new evidence not previously available, (2) an intervening change in controlling law, or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or to prevent manifest injustice. New Chemic (U.S.), Inc. v. Fine Grinding Corp., 948 F. Supp. 17, 18-19 (E.D. Pa. 1996).

A motion for reconsideration is not intended to provide a losing party with a second bite at the apple. The motion "is not properly grounded on a request that a court reconsider repetitive arguments that have been fully examined by the court." Tobin v. Gen. Elec. Co., Civ. Act. No. 95-4003, 1998 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 693, at \*4 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 27, 1998). The motion "addresses only factual and legal matters that the court may have overlooked. It is improper on a motion for reconsideration to ask the Court to rethink what it had already thought through – rightly or wrongly." Glendon Energy Co. v. Borough of Glendon, 836 F. Supp. 1109, 1122 (E.D. Pa. 1993) (citations and internal alterations omitted).

Although Plaintiff argues that a recently discovered March 18, 2004 letter provides newly discovered evidence that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") did in fact investigate her alleged claims of race and gender discrimination, I disagree. The letter does not amount to new evidence. First, Plaintiff's response to this letter, which requests a response to AstraZeneca's position statement, was presented to the Court along with Plaintiff's opposition to the original motion to dismiss and included all of the Plaintiff's allegations made to the EEOC in her Charge Questionnaire. Second, the letter itself gives no indication of an actual investigation undertaken by the EEOC of which notice was provided to

AstraZeneca. Similarly to Plaintiffs Charge Questionnaire, the letter does not expand upon Plaintiff's signed Charges of Discrimination, which are devoid of allegations of race and gender discrimination. As a result, Plaintiff has failed to present new evidence that her claims were in fact investigated by the EEOC or that notice was provided to AstraZeneca. The motion to vacate will, accordingly, be denied.

An appropriate Order follows.

