

reconsideration in the district courts are generally disfavored because “a re-do of a matter that has already received the court’s attention is seldom a productive use of taxpayer resources because it places all other matters on hold.” *Burton v. McCormick*, No. 3:11–CV–026, 2011 WL 1792849, at *1 (N.D. Ind. May 11, 2011) (quoting *United States v. Menominee Tribal Enters.*, No. 07–C–317, 2009 WL 1373952, at *1 (E.D. Wis. May 15, 2009)).

Wine & Canvas contends the Court has made an error assessing the damage to Tamara Scott’s relationship with her father, Donald McCracken—both Third-Party Defendants—if Defendant Christopher Muylle is allowed to reopen the deposition of Mr. McCracken. Wine & Canvas has not presented argument or new law that would support a different ruling on a motion for reconsideration. The Court reiterates however, that the deposition may be reopened for inquiry of this one issue and a one-half day or even a one hour deposition seems excessive and unreasonable.

Because Wine & Canvas has not provided a legitimate basis upon which the Court should reconsider its prior order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), the Motion to Reconsider (Dkt. 289) is **DENIED**. So Ordered:

Date: 04/15/2014



Hon. Tanya Walton Pratt, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

THEODORE WEISSER
25 Rodeo Ave., Apt. 2
Sausalito, CA 94965

P. Adam Davis
DAVIS & SARBINOFF LLP
adavis@d-slaw.com

Carol Nemeth Joven
PRICE WAICUKAUSKI & RILEY
cnemeth@price-law.com

Ronald J. Waicukauski
PRICE WAICUKAUSKI & RILEY
rwaicukauski@price-law.com