

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF CHARLESTON

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
NINTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

CASE NO.: 2022-CP-10-04068

Tammy Moore,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Basem Al Khtaebah,
Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

RECEIVED
Dec 13 2023
SC Court of Appeals

The Defendant filed a Motion for Reconsideration on October 27, 2023, pursuant to Rule 59(e), SCRCPP, asking this Court to reconsider the Court's Order, filed October 18, 2023, denying Defendant's Motion to Set Aside Entry of Default and entering judgment following Plaintiff's Damages hearing.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Motions for reconsideration will not be granted absent "highly unusual circumstances." U.S. ex rel. Becker v. Washington Savannah River Co., 305 F.3d 284, 290 (4th Cir. 2002) (stating that simple disagreements with the court's ruling will not support Rule 59(e) relief).¹ Courts have recognized three circumstances in which a court should grant a Rule 59(e) motion: (1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available at trial; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice." Hutchinson v. Staton, 994 F.2d 1076, 1081 (4th Cir. 1993). Importantly, a motion for reconsideration is not a vehicle to re-litigate previously raised issues or "to raise argument or present evidence that could have been presented prior to the entry of judgment." Dash v. Mayweather, C/A No. 3:10-1036-

¹ Rule 59 is substantially the same as the Federal Rule. *See Elam v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, 361 S.C. 9, 21, 602 S.E. 2d 772, 779 (2004) ("Rule 59(e) in the South Carolina and federal rules of civil procedure is practically identical.").

JFA, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 95277, *2 (D.S.C. Sept. 13, 2010) (quoting Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker, 554 U.S. 471, n.5 (2008)). In other words, “[a] party cannot use Rule 59(e) to present to the court an issue the party could have raised prior to judgment but did not.” Stevens & Wilkinson of S.C., Inc. v. City of Columbia, 409 S.C. 563, 567, 762 S.E.2d 693, 695 (2014); Patterson v. Reid, 318 S.C. 183, 185, 456 S.E.2d 436, 437 (Ct. App. 1995). Nor does “[a] party’s mere disagreement with the court’s ruling . . . warrant a Rule 59(e) motion.” In re Pella Corp. Architect & Designer Series Windows Mktg., Sales Practices & Prods. Liab. Litig., 269 F.Supp. 3d 685, 691 (D.S.C. 2017); *see also* Lyons v. Fid. Nat’l Title Ins. Co., 415 S.C. 115, 135, 781 S.E.2d 126, 137 (Ct. App. 2015).

After consideration of the issues raised in Defendant’s Motion, the Court hereby DENIES Defendant’s Motion for Reconsideration.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE PAGE TO FOLLOW



Charleston Common Pleas

Case Caption: Tammy Moore VS Basem Al Khtaeb

Case Number: 2022CP1004068

Type: Order/Other

IT IS SO ORDERED!

/s Hon. Bentley D. Price, Circuit Judge 2766

Electronically signed on 2023-11-13 10:17:07 page 3 of 3