

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CASE NO.: 8:14-cr-190-T-24EAJ

vs.

STEPHEN MAYER

_____ /

ORDER

This cause comes before the Court on Defendant's pro-se Motion to Reconsider. (Doc. No. 239). Specifically, Defendant asks the Court to reconsider its March 5, 2018 order denying his motion for recusal. (Doc. No. 236). In that order, the Court found "that Defendant has not provided sufficient facts or reasons for his belief that bias or prejudice exists sufficient to convince a reasonable person that bias actually exists," and therefore, Defendant had not shown that recusal was warranted.

There are three major grounds justifying reconsideration: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; and (3) the need to correct clear error or to prevent manifest injustice. Sussman v. Salem, Saxon & Nielsen, P.A., 153 F.R.D. 689, 694 (M.D. Fla. 1994)(citations omitted). The Court notes that reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly. See id. (citations omitted). It appears that Defendant contends that reconsideration is warranted in order to correct clear error or to prevent manifest injustice.

However, upon review of the motion, Defendant simply rehashes arguments that the Court has already considered and rejected. Therefore, the Court finds that reconsideration is not warranted. See Allaben v. Howanitz, 579 Fed. Appx. 716, 719 (11th Cir. 2014)(stating that a

motion for reconsideration should not be used to simply rehash arguments that were previously made).

Accordingly, it is ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Defendant's pro-se Motion to Reconsider (Doc. No. 239) is **DENIED**.

It is so Ordered this 23rd day of March, 2018.


SUSAN C. BUCKLEW
United States District Judge

Copy furnished to: Stephen Mayer, Pro-se