

**DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS**

**DIVISION OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN**

**JOAN OAT,**

**Plaintiff,**

**3:03-cv-115**

**v.**

**SEWER ENTERPRISES, LTD f/k/a SEWER  
DOLIN ASSOCIATES, LTD., and ESTATE  
OF LLEWELLYN A. SEWER,**

**Defendants.**

**TO: Joan C. Oat, *Pro Se*  
A. Jeffrey Weiss, Esq.  
Samuel H. Hall, Jr., Esq.  
Kevin W. Weatherbee, Esq.**

**ORDER**

THIS MATTER came before the Court upon the Motion For Reconsideration of February 3, 2010[, ] Order (Docket No. 450). The time for filing any response has expired.

Pursuant to Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7.3, parties may seek reconsideration of an order or decision of the Court based upon "1. intervening change in controlling law; 2. availability of new evidence, or; 3. the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice." LRCi 7.3. It is well established that "[a] motion for reconsideration '[i]s not a vehicle for registering disagreement with the court's initial decision, for rearguing matters

*Oat v. Sewer Enterprises*

3:03-cv-115

Order

Page 2

already addressed by the court, or for raising arguments that could have been raised before but were not.’” *Worldwide Flight Services v. Government of the Virgin Islands*, S.Ct. Civ. No. 2008-014, 2009 WL 152316 at \*3 (V.I. January 21, 2009) (quoting *Bostic v. AT & T of the Virgin Islands*, 312 F. Supp. 2d 731, 733 (D.V.I. 2004)). Having reviewed the matter and upon due consideration thereof, the Court finds that reconsideration is not warranted. While movant notes that the Court has the authority to appoint a substitute receiver, movant fails to persuade the Court that such appointment is mandatory. Consequently, movant has provided no basis for reconsideration.

Accordingly, it is now hereby **ORDERED** that the Motion For Reconsideration of February 3, 2010[, ] Order (Docket No. 450) is **DENIED**.

ENTER:

Dated: March 9, 2010

/s/ George W. Cannon, Jr.  
GEORGE W. CANNON, JR.  
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE