

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 14-cr-20780

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CURTIS SCOTT,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION  
FOR RECONSIDERATION (ECF #397)**

On March 9, 2016, a jury convicted Defendant Curtis Scott of aiding and abetting a carjacking, aiding and abetting the use and/or carrying of a firearm during a crime of violence, and making a false statement to a federal agent. Following his conviction, Scott moved for a new trial pursuant to Rule 33 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. (*See* ECF ## 144, 162). The Court denied the motion in a written order dated May 10, 2018. (*See* ECF #380.) Scott then filed four motions with the Court: a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s May 10, 2018, order denying his motion for a new trial (ECF #387), another motion for a new trial (ECF #384), a motion “to see” (ECF #383), and a motion for oral argument (ECF #385). On May 31, 2018, the Court entered an order denying all four motions (the “Order”). (*See* ECF #391.) Scott has now filed a motion for reconsideration of the Order. (*See* ECF #397.)

Motions for reconsideration are governed by Local Rule 7.1(h). That rule provides:

Generally, and without restricting the Court's discretion, the Court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the Court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the Court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

E.D. Mich. Local Rule 7.1(h)(3). The Court has reviewed Scott's motion for reconsideration and concludes that he has not met this standard. Scott has failed to persuade the Court that the Order contains palpable defects, and Scott has not shown that correction of any of the alleged defects would result in a different disposition of his four motions. Accordingly, Scott's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Matthew F. Leitman  
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 11, 2018

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 11, 2018, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda  
Case Manager  
(810) 341-9764