

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
ORLANDO DIVISION**

LESLIE FERDERIGOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No: 6:23-cv-189-WWB-LHP

THE FLORIDA BAR and FLORIDA  
SUPREME COURT,

Defendants

---

**ORDER**

This cause came on for consideration without oral argument on the following motion filed herein:

**MOTION: MOTION FOR REHEARING ON ORDER FILED 10-13-2023 DOC. 87 (Doc. No. 90)**

**FILED: October 13, 2023**

---

**THEREON it is ORDERED that the motion is DENIED.**

By the above-styled motion, Plaintiff a former attorney now appearing *pro se*, seeks reconsideration of the Court's Order denying her "(Amended) Motion for Leave to Reply Pursuant to Fed. Rule 3.01(d); Motion to Strike Defendant's Response" (Doc. No. 81). Doc. No. 90. The bases for the motion include: (1) the

undersigned's alleged requirement that Plaintiff comply with Local Rule 3.01(g) without holding Defendants to the same standard; (2) the undersigned should have recused herself prior to ruling on the motion; and (3) the undersigned denied the motion on bases not previously pointed out to Plaintiff in denying her prior motions. *Id.* Defendant The Florida Bar has filed a response in opposition. Doc. No. 93. For the reasons argued in the response, the motion will be denied.

As an initial matter, the motion fails to comply with Local Rule 3.01(a) because it does not include a memorandum of legal authority in support, and it is due to be denied on this basis alone. Relatedly, the motion provides no legal basis for reconsideration. To the extent that Plaintiff says the undersigned should have recused herself prior to ruling on the underlying motion, this argument is unpersuasive for the same reasons the undersigned denied Plaintiff's two motions to disqualify. *See* Doc. Nos. 91, 94. And insofar as Plaintiff says that the undersigned has not evenhandedly applied Local Rule 3.01(g), Plaintiff is mistaken, for the reasons previously explained. *See* Doc. No. 94. Finally, the undersigned finds Plaintiff's third argument unpersuasive for the reasons argued by The Florida Bar in response, Doc. No. 93, at 5, namely, because the previous version of the motion that the Court actually ruled on did not suffer the same deficiencies as the one for which Plaintiff seeks reconsideration. *Compare* Doc. Nos. 68, 69, 72, *with* Doc. Nos. 81, 87. *But see* Doc. Nos. 78, 82 (denying motions for leave to file reply

as moot based on the filing of an amended motion and duplicate motion, which orders did not include a substantive discussion regarding the motions).

For these reasons, the above-styled motion (Doc. No. 90) is **DENIED**.

**DONE** and **ORDERED** in Orlando, Florida on November 27, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
LESLIE HOFFMAN PRICE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

Counsel of Record  
Unrepresented Parties