

STATE OF MICHIGAN
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND

CHERYL BUOL,

Plaintiff,

v

Case No. 15-145255-CD
Hon. Wendy Potts

HAYMAN COMPANY,

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION ON THE
COMPLAINT

At a session of Court
Held in Pontiac, Michigan
On

JUN 10 2016

The matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Cheryl Buol's Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's April 6, 2016 Order regarding Defendant Hayman Company's Motion for Summary Disposition pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(10). The Court dispenses with oral argument pursuant to MCR 2.119(F)(2).

Plaintiff requests the Court reverse its grant of summary disposition. MCR 2.119(F) governs Motions for Rehearing or Reconsideration. The decision whether to grant or deny reconsideration is discretionary. MCR 2.119(F)(3); *Charbeneau v Wayne County General Hosp*, 158 Mich App 730, 733 (1987).

MCR 2.119(F)(3) provides, in relevant part:

[A] motion for rehearing or reconsideration which merely presents the same issues ruled on by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication, will


not be granted. The moving party must demonstrate a palpable error by which the court and the parties have been misled and show that a different disposition of the motion must result from correction of the error.

The Court finds that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration merely presents the same issues that were already considered and ruled on by this Court. Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate a palpable error and show that a different disposition of its motion must result from correction of the error. Accordingly, Plaintiff Cheryl Buol's motion is denied.

Dated:

JUN 10 2016

IT IS SO ORDERED


Hon. Wendy Potts