

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE Northern District of Illinois – CM/ECF LIVE, Ver 6.3.3  
Eastern Division**

Laura Briscoe, et al.

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: 1:16–cv–10294

Honorable John Robert Blakey

Health Care Services Corporation, et al.

Defendant.

---

**NOTIFICATION OF DOCKET ENTRY**

This docket entry was made by the Clerk on Tuesday, June 9, 2020:

MINUTE entry before the Honorable John Robert Blakey: Plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration, [150], is denied. To prevail on a motion to reconsider, the movant must establish "a manifest error of law or fact or present newly discovered evidence." *Vesely v. Armslist LLC*, 762 F.3d 661, 666 (7th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Boyd v. Tornier, Inc.*, 656 F.3d 487, 492 (7th Cir. 2011)); *Obriecht v. Raemisch*, 517 F.3d 489, 494 (7th Cir. 2008). A "manifest error is not demonstrated by the disappointment" of the losing party; instead, there must be a showing of the "wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent." *Oto v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, 224 F.3d 601, 606 (7th Cir. 2000) (quoting *Sedrak v. Callahan*, 987 F. Supp. 1063, 1069 (N.D. Ill. 1997)). A motion to reconsider may also be appropriate if there has been a "controlling or significant change in the law or facts since the submission of the issue to the Court." *Bank of Waunakee v. Rochester Cheese Sales, Inc.*, 906 F.2d 1185, 1191 (7th Cir. 1990). Consequently, in light of this "heavy" burden, motions to reconsider are rarely permitted and generally disfavored. *Patrick v. City of Chicago*, 103 F.Supp.3d 907, 911–12 (N.D. Ill. 2015). Here, Plaintiffs fail to meet the heavy burden needed for reconsideration. This Court previously considered the facts and controlling case law Plaintiffs offer in the current motion and determined that Plaintiffs failed to show that Dr. Hanley's and Ms. Peluso's testimony was based upon a reliable methodology. [138]. Plaintiffs introduce no new facts or case law that justify granting Plaintiffs' motion. Moreover, Plaintiffs frequently state the "methodology employed by each of Plaintiffs' experts was based on her experience and qualifications, and tied to her respective conclusions." [180] at 2. Yet despite the contents of both expert reports, Plaintiffs' briefs in opposition to Defendants' Daubert motion, and now Plaintiffs' motion to reconsider and its reply brief, exactly what the methodology employed by Plaintiffs' experts remains undefined by the record. Mailed notice(gel, )

**ATTENTION:** This notice is being sent pursuant to Rule 77(d) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or Rule 49(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. It was

generated by CM/ECF, the automated docketing system used to maintain the civil and criminal dockets of this District. If a minute order or other document is enclosed, please refer to it for additional information.

For scheduled events, motion practices, recent opinions and other information, visit our web site at [www.ilnd.uscourts.gov](http://www.ilnd.uscourts.gov).