

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE
IN AND FOR NEW CASTLE COUNTY

KENNETH T. DEPUTY,)
)
Plaintiff,)
) C.A. No. 07C-01-202 MMJ
v.)
)
DR. CONLAN, JAMES WELCH,)
and THOMAS CARROLL,)
)
Defendants.)

Submitted: February 16, 2012
Decided: April 12, 2012

On Plaintiff Kenneth T. Deputy's
Motion for Reargument
DENIED

ORDER

Kenneth T. Deputy, Plaintiff, *Pro Se*

JOHNSTON, J.

1. By Order dated January 31, 2012, the Court denied plaintiff's fourth Motion for Appointment of Counsel.

2. Plaintiff Kenneth T. Deputy has moved for reargument. Attached to his motion are three letters, reflecting unsuccessful attempts by plaintiff to obtain private counsel.

3. The purpose of moving for reargument is to seek reconsideration of findings of fact, conclusions of law, or judgment of law.¹ Reargument usually will be denied unless the moving party demonstrates that the Court overlooked a precedent or legal principle that would have a controlling effect, or that it has misapprehended the law or the facts in a manner affecting the outcome of the decision. "A motion for reargument should not be used merely to rehash the arguments already decided by the court."²

4. The Court has reviewed and considered plaintiff's motion and the additional letters. These submissions do not provide a basis for the Court to alter its opinion. Further, the Court did not overlook a controlling precedent or legal

¹*Hessler, Inc. v. Farrell*, 260 A.2d 701, 702 (1969).

²*Wilmington Trust Co. v. Nix*, Del. Super., 2002 WL 356371, Witham, J. (Feb. 21, 2002); *Whitsett v. Capital School District*, Del. Super., C.A. No. 97C-04-032 Vaughn, J. (Jan. 28, 1999); *Monsanto Co. v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co.*, Del. Super., C.A. No. 88-JA-118, Ridgeley, P.J. (Jan. 14, 1994).

principle, or misapprehend the law or the facts in a manner affecting the outcome of the decision.

THEREFORE, Plaintiff's Motion for Reargument is hereby **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Mary M. Johnston

The Honorable Mary M. Johnston