

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

VALEO CLIMATE CONTROL CORP, et al,

Plaintiffs/Counter-Defendants,

v

Case No. 2015-146415-CK  
Hon. Wendy Potts

DETROIT THERMAL SYSTEMS, LLC,

Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff.

---

OPINION AND ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR REHEARING OR  
RECONSIDERATION

At a session of Court  
Held in Pontiac, Michigan

**FEB 19<sup>th</sup> 2016**

---

Plaintiffs move the Court to reconsider its decision dismissing Valeo's claims and granting Defendant's Motion for Summary Disposition regarding packaging and transportation costs. The Court has discretion to grant or deny reconsideration. MCR 2.119(F)(3); *Charbeneau v Wayne County General Hosp*, 158 Mich App 730, 733; 405 NW2d 151 (1987). Reconsideration is warranted if a party identifies a palpable error by which the Court and the parties have been misled and shows that a different disposition must result from correction of that error. MCR 2.119(F)(3).


Most of Plaintiffs' arguments for reconsideration were raised in its brief in opposition of Defendant's motion for summary disposition. Plaintiffs cannot demonstrate grounds for reconsideration by reiterating arguments that were raised and rejected in the Court's decision on the original motion. *Churchman v Rickerson*, 240 Mich App 223, 233; 611 NW2d 333 (2000).

The fact that Defendants disagree with the Court's reasoning or conclusions does not amount to palpable error. *Herald Co v Tax Tribunal*, 258 Mich App 78, 83; 669 NW2d 862 (2003).

Because Defendants fail to demonstrate palpable error in the Court's decision, the motion for reconsideration is denied.

Dated: FEB 19 2016

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Wendy Potts