

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

LEONARD BECKER	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	No. 11-6460
THE BANK OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUST	:	
COMPANY, N.A. and J.P. MORGAN TRUST	:	(Consolidated with No. 12-6412)
COMPANY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 28th day of September, 2016, upon consideration of Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 138), Plaintiff's Response (Doc. No. 139), Defendants' Reply (Doc. No. 140), and Plaintiff's further Response (Doc. No. 141), it is hereby ORDERED that Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.<sup>1</sup>

A brief Memorandum will follow.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Legrome D. Davis

Legrome D. Davis, J.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendants move for reconsideration of the Order entered March 23, 2016 (Doc. No. 137), which decided the parties' respective Motions for Summary Judgment (Doc. Nos. 125, 126). Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 138) does not present any of the narrow grounds for granting reconsideration. "The purpose of a motion for reconsideration . . . is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." Max's Seafood Café, Inc. ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (quoting Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985)); accord United States v. Dupree, 617 F.3d 724, 732 (3d Cir. 2010) (the purpose is "to correct a clear error of law or to prevent a manifest injustice in the District Court's original ruling."). Reconsideration is "granted for compelling reasons, such as a change in the law which reveals that an earlier ruling was erroneous, not for addressing arguments that a party should have raised earlier." Id. at 732-33 (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Such motions cannot "be used as an opportunity to relitigate the case" and "cannot be used to present new arguments that could have been raised prior to judgment." Blystone v. Horn, 664 F.3d 397, 416 (3d Cir. 2011) (quoting Howard v. United States, 533 F.3d 472, 475 (6th Cir. 2008)).