

EXHIBIT E

Westlaw.

Slip Copy
Slip Copy, 2006 WL 2092469 (S.D.N.Y.)
(Cite as: Slip Copy)

Page 1

H

Briefs and Other Related Documents

Poddar v. State Bank of India S.D.N.Y., 2006. Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

United States District Court, S.D. New York.
Shrikumar PODDAR, individually and as plan administrator and trustee; Mayurika Poddar, individually and as trustee; Vaishnava Center for Enlightenment, Inc., d.b.a. International Service Society; and India Foundation, Inc. on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated,
Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE BANK OF INDIA, Defendant.

No. 98 Civ. 1691(MGC).

July 26, 2006.

Briefs and Other Related Documents ([Back to top](#))

• [1:98cv01691](#) (Docket) (Mar. 6, 1998)

END OF DOCUMENT

Kevin C. Walker, Paul F. Doyle, Kelley, Drye & Warren, L.L.P., New York, NY, for Defendant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

CEDARBAUM, J.

*1 Plaintiffs move for reconsideration of my June 14, 2006 order on their motion for class certification. Local Rule 6.3 requires that those who seek reconsideration demonstrate that the court has “overlooked matters or controlling decisions which, had they been considered, might reasonably have altered the result.” Donahue v. Pendleton Woolen Mills, Inc., 719 F.Supp. 149, 151 (S.D.N.Y.1988) (internal quotation marks omitted). A motion for reconsideration “is not intended as a vehicle for a party dissatisfied with the Court’s ruling to advance new theories that the movant failed to advance in connection with the underlying motion, nor to secure a rehearing on the merits with regard to issues already decided.” Montanile v. Nat’l Broad. Co., 216 F.Supp.2d 341, 342 (S.D.N.Y.2002). Because plaintiffs have not satisfied the standard for reconsideration, the motion is denied. Furthermore, plaintiffs’ new and vague request for additional discovery is not a ground for reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

S.D.N.Y., 2006.
Poddar v. State Bank of India
Slip Copy, 2006 WL 2092469 (S.D.N.Y.)