

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND

LAWRENCE F. JASPER, II,  
Plaintiff,

Case No. 2015-147901-CB  
Hon. Wendy Potts

v

BLOOMFIELD VILLAGE INVESTOR  
HOLDINGS, LLC, DONALD J. NEWMAN,  
CRG CAPITAL PARTNERS, STEVE TOWLE,  
PCCP, LLC, and REDICO, LLC,  
Defendants.

---

**OPINION AND ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF  
THE ORDER AND OPINION ISSUED ON AUGUST 5, 2016**

At a session of Court  
Held in Pontiac, Michigan  
On

~~AUG 31 2016~~

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of the Order and Opinion Issued on August 5, 2016." The Court dispenses with oral argument pursuant to MCR 2.119(F)(2).

In review of Plaintiff's motion, the Court relies on MCR 2.119(F)(3), which 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 grant or denial of a motion for reconsideration rests within the discretion of the trial court." *Charbeneau v Wayne Cty. Gen. Hosp.*, 158 Mich App 730, 733; 405 NW2d 151 (1987).

On June 8, 2016, the Bloomfield Defendants, namely Bloomfield Village Investor Holdings, LLC, Redico, LLC, PCCP, LLC, and Steve Towle, filed a Motion for Sanctions and Other Relief against Plaintiff. Following the motion hearing, the Court entered an Order Regarding Motion to allow Plaintiff additional time to file a written response to the Bloomfield Defendants' Motion for Sanctions and Other Relief. Plaintiff subsequently filed his Response on June 22, 2016. The Bloomfield Defendants then filed a Reply Brief on June 23, 2016 and Plaintiff filed an additional submission in support of his response on June 24, 2016.


Upon review of the parties' arguments as outlined in their respective submissions, the Court issued an Opinion and Order Re: Defendants' Motion for Sanctions and Other Relief on August 5, 2016. Thereafter, Plaintiff timely filed his motion for reconsideration.

The Court has considered Plaintiff's arguments in his reconsideration motion, as they relate to the Court's August 5, 2016 Opinion and Order, and finds that Plaintiff's arguments fail to 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.

Accordingly, the Court hereby denies Plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of the Order and Opinion Issued on August 5, 2016."

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: **AUG 31 2016**

  
Hon. Wendy Potts  
Circuit Court Judge