

**THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

## HEATHER BRELAND,

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**CITY OF CENTERVILLE, GEORGIA,  
and TERRY LEE WARE, JR.,  
Individually and in his Official  
Capacity as a Police Officer of the  
City of Centerville, Georgia,**

## Defendants.

1  
 2  
 3  
 4  
 5  
 6  
 7  
 8  
 9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28  
 29  
 30  
 31  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37  
 38  
 39  
 40  
 41  
 42  
 43  
 44  
 45  
 46  
 47  
 48  
 49  
 50  
 51  
 52  
 53  
 54  
 55  
 56  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65  
 66  
 67  
 68  
 69  
 70  
 71  
 72  
 73  
 74  
 75  
 76  
 77  
 78  
 79  
 80  
 81  
 82  
 83  
 84  
 85  
 86  
 87  
 88  
 89  
 90  
 91  
 92  
 93  
 94  
 95  
 96  
 97  
 98  
 99  
 100  
 101  
 102  
 103  
 104  
 105  
 106  
 107  
 108  
 109  
 110  
 111  
 112  
 113  
 114  
 115  
 116  
 117  
 118  
 119  
 120  
 121  
 122  
 123  
 124  
 125  
 126  
 127  
 128  
 129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174  
 175  
 176  
 177  
 178  
 179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232  
 233  
 234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260  
 261  
 262  
 263  
 264  
 265  
 266  
 267  
 268  
 269  
 270  
 271  
 272  
 273  
 274  
 275  
 276  
 277  
 278  
 279  
 280  
 281  
 282  
 283  
 284  
 285  
 286  
 287  
 288  
 289  
 290  
 291  
 292  
 293  
 294  
 295  
 296  
 297  
 298  
 299  
 300  
 301  
 302  
 303  
 304  
 305  
 306  
 307  
 308  
 309  
 310  
 311  
 312  
 313  
 314  
 315  
 316  
 317  
 318  
 319  
 320  
 321  
 322  
 323  
 324  
 325  
 326  
 327  
 328  
 329  
 330  
 331  
 332  
 333  
 334  
 335  
 336  
 337  
 338  
 339  
 340  
 341  
 342  
 343  
 344  
 345  
 346  
 347  
 348  
 349  
 350  
 351  
 352  
 353  
 354  
 355  
 356  
 357  
 358  
 359  
 360  
 361  
 362  
 363  
 364  
 365  
 366  
 367  
 368  
 369  
 370  
 371  
 372  
 373  
 374  
 375  
 376  
 377  
 378  
 379  
 380  
 381  
 382  
 383  
 384  
 385  
 386  
 387  
 388  
 389  
 390  
 391  
 392  
 393  
 394  
 395  
 396  
 397  
 398  
 399  
 400  
 401  
 402  
 403  
 404  
 405  
 406  
 407  
 408  
 409  
 410  
 411  
 412  
 413  
 414  
 415  
 416  
 417  
 418  
 419  
 420  
 421  
 422  
 423  
 424  
 425  
 426  
 427  
 428  
 429  
 430  
 431  
 432  
 433  
 434  
 435  
 436  
 437  
 438  
 439  
 440  
 441  
 442  
 443  
 444  
 445  
 446  
 447  
 448  
 449  
 450  
 451  
 452  
 453  
 454  
 455  
 456  
 457  
 458  
 459  
 460  
 461  
 462  
 463  
 464  
 465  
 466  
 467  
 468  
 469  
 470  
 471  
 472  
 473  
 474  
 475  
 476  
 477  
 478  
 479  
 480  
 481  
 482  
 483  
 484  
 485  
 486  
 487  
 488  
 489  
 490  
 491  
 492  
 493  
 494  
 495  
 496  
 497  
 498  
 499  
 500  
 501  
 502  
 503  
 504  
 505  
 506  
 507  
 508  
 509  
 510  
 511  
 512  
 513  
 514  
 515  
 516  
 517  
 518  
 519  
 520  
 521  
 522  
 523  
 524  
 525

## Civil Action

**No. 5:07-cv-27(CAR)**

## ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On May 28, 2008, the Court entered an Order granting Summary Judgment in favor of Defendant City of Centerville (“Centerville”). The case remains open as to all claims against Defendant Terry Lee Ware, Jr. related to the sexual assault he committed against Plaintiff. Plaintiff has since filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the Summary Judgment Order as it applies to her claim of negligent hiring and retention under Georgia law. Because Plaintiff’s motion fails to demonstrate that the Court committed clear error in its decision, the Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 34) is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff filed her Motion for Reconsideration prior to the entry of final judgment in the case; therefore, her motion calls for the exercise of the Court's inherent discretion to reconsider and amend its orders any time prior to the entry of final judgment. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b). In the interests of judicial efficiency and finality of decisions, "reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly." Groover v. Michelin North America, Inc., 90 F. Supp. 2d 1236, 1256 (M.D. Ala. 2000). This Court's Local Rule 7.6 provides that motions for reconsideration should not be filed as a matter of routine practice, but only when "absolutely necessary." Reconsideration is appropriate "only if the movant demonstrates [1] that there has been an intervening change in the law, [2] that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or [3] that the court made a clear error of law." McCoy v. Macon Water Authority, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997). "Additional facts and arguments that should have been raised in the first instance are not appropriate grounds for a motion for reconsideration." Groover, 90 F. Supp. 2d at 1256. "In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate his prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived." McCoy, 966 F. Supp. at 1223.

Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is nothing more than a restatement of arguments that were thoroughly briefed by the parties and weighed by the Court, and the Court is not persuaded that its original finding was erroneous. As to Plaintiff's State law claims of negligent hiring and retention, the Court granted summary judgment because there was a lack of evidence to show that it was reasonably foreseeable to Centerville that Officer Ware would cause the type of harm sustained by the Plaintiff. The Court thoroughly reviewed Ware's record, including reports from the GBI's investigation of his sexual assault of Plaintiff and of his inappropriate sexual conduct with another arrestee, Shasta Winters. There is no evidence in the record that any of Ware's supervisors knew or should have known of this pattern of conduct prior to the assault on Plaintiff. Ware assaulted Plaintiff on December 27, 2004. His prior misconduct with Winters did not come to light until after Ware had been terminated on other grounds, in February 2005. Centerville first became aware of the incident with Plaintiff and of the incidents involving Winters at the same time, when Plaintiff and Winters met in jail and made a complaint to the jail staff.

Plaintiff appears to contend that Centerville should have been aware of Ware's conduct with Winters due to its egregious nature. This is nothing more than speculation and is not supported by any evidence in the record. The only evidence

indicates that Ware and Winters engaged in their sexual conduct surreptitiously, and took steps to conceal it from other officers on the Centerville force.

Plaintiff has moved to supplement the record with a portion of the GBI investigation report that was not previously before the Court. Although Plaintiff has shown no reason for her failure to submit this portion of the report along with the remainder of the report that was submitted in opposition to Centerville's Motion for Summary Judgment, the Court has reviewed it, and finds that it adds nothing to the evidence provided in connection with the summary judgment decision. In fact, this new portion of the GBI report only adds further support to the conclusion that Centerville had no knowledge of Ware's activities with Winters. According to the report, prepared by GBI Special Agent Leah Lightner, Winters stated during a May 13, 2005 interview that she had intentionally kept Ware's activities a secret:

WINTERS described all the officers as nice officers. WINTERS stated she was never going to say anything about what WINTERS and Officer WARE had done, because WINTERS thought she was the only one. It was not until WINTERS got to the Houston County Jail in the early part of 2005, when WINTERS heard HEATHER BRELAND describe that WARE had tried to make moves on BRELAND as well. WINTERS stated there have got to be other girls out there that Officer WARE had done this to and they must think they are the only ones and that was why nobody has said anything.

Pl's M. for Recons., Ex. 1 p. 22.

The new portions of Lightner's report submitted with Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration also describe an interview with a third victim of Ware's conduct not previously known to the Court. This evidence again fails to show that Centerville knew or should have known of Ware's sexual misconduct at the time he assaulted Plaintiff. There is no indication that anyone had knowledge of this third victim before she made contact with Agent Lightner on May 13, 2005. See Id., p. 29. This conduct came to light long after Ware had been terminated due to other misconduct that did not relate to the sexual or physical abuse of arrestees. It cannot establish that Centerville knew or should have known of Ware's prior sexual misconduct. In the absence of evidence to show that Centerville knew or should have known of Ware's tendency to assault arrestees, there is no genuine issue of fact as to causation, and Centerville remains entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

It is SO ORDERED this 20th day of January, 2009.

S/ C. Ashley Royal  
C. ASHLEY ROYAL, JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

chw