

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

ANTHONY DOMENIC REO,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARTIN LINDSTEDT.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:19-cv-02615-JRA

Hon. John R. Adams

Mag. Carmen E. Henderson

REO LAW, LLC

Bryan Anthony Reo (#0097470)

P.O. Box 5100

Mentor, OH 44061

(T): (440) 313-5893

(E): reo@reolaw.org

Attorney for Anthony Domenic Reo

MARTIN LINDSTEDT

338 Rabbit Track Road

Granby, MO 64844

(T): (417) 472-6901

(E): pastorlindstedt@gmail.com

Pro se Defendant

**PLAINTIFF ANTHONY DOMENIC REO'S
BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

NOW COMES Anthony Domenic Reo (“Plaintiff”), *by and through the undersigned attorney* and hereby propounds upon Martin Lindstedt (“Defendant”) and this Honorable Court Plaintiff Anthony Domenic Reo’s Brief in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion for Reconsideration. Because Defendant’s motion fails to articulate a legally sufficient and procedurally proper basis by which he would be entitled to reconsideration, and Defendant simply attempts to repeat previously rejected arguments, the Court should deny Defendant’s motion in the entirety.

On April 18, 2021, this Court issued an opinion and order granting summary judgment in favor of Plaintiff in the amount of \$500,000.00 dollars (EFC No. 43).

On May 12, 2021 Defendant filed a Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 46).

A court may grant a motion to amend or alter judgment if a clear error of law or newly discovered evidence exists, an intervening change in controlling law occurs, or to prevent manifest injustice. See *Gencorp, Inc. v. Am. Int'l Underwriters*, 178 F.3d 804, 834 (6th Cir. 1999). The Court should specifically note the emphasis on “may” which denotes the matter is one of a discretionary nature. Even if Defendant were to somehow meet the procedural burdens of making a showing for reconsideration, such would be completely discretionary and Defendant has never done anything in the instant action to demonstrate himself worthy of being the beneficiary of such discretion.

A motion for reconsideration generally requires a showing of “(1) a clear error of law; (2) newly discovered evidence that was not previously available to the parties; or (3) an intervening change in controlling law.” *Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Ass’n, Inc. v. Arctic Exp., Inc.*, 288 F. Supp.2d 895, 900 (S.D. Ohio 2003) (citing *GenCorp., Inc.*, 178 F.3d at 834); see also *Boler Co. v. Watson & Chalin Mfg. Inc.*, 372 F. Supp. 2d 1013, 1025 (N.D. Ohio 2004) (quoting *General Truck Drivers, Local No. 957 v. Dayton Newspaper, Inc.*, 190 F.3d 434, 445 (6th Cir. 1999) (Clay, J. dissenting), *cert. denied*, 528 U.S. 1137 (2000)); *Henderson v. Walled Lake Consol. Sch.*, 469 F.3d 479, 496 (6th Cir. 2006). “Motions for reconsideration do not allow the losing party to ‘repeat arguments previously considered and rejected, or to raise new legal theories that should have been raised earlier.’” *Id.*

In the Sixth Circuit, a motion for reconsideration is construed as a motion to alter or amend the judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e). See *Moody v. Pepsi-Cola Metro. Bottling Co.*, 915 F.2d 201, 206 (6th Cir. 1990). Under Rule 59(e), a district court may grant a motion to alter or amend the judgment if the movant shows: “(1) a clear error of law; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) an intervening change in controlling law; or (4) a need to prevent manifest injustice.” *Brumley v. United Parcel Serv., Inc.*, 909 F.3d 834, 841 (6th Cir. 2018) (quotation omitted). The purpose of Rule 59(e) is to give district courts an opportunity to fix their mistakes without going through a costly and unnecessary appeals process. See *Howard v. United States*, 533 F.3d 472, 475 (6th Cir. 2008). However, Rule 59 motions “may not be used to relitigate old matters, or to raise arguments or present evidence that could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment.” *Brumley*, 909 F.3d at 841 (quoting *Exxon Shipping Co. v. Baker*, 554 U.S. 471, 486 n.5 (2008)). In general, motions for reconsideration are disfavored. *Davie v. Mitchell*, 291 F. Supp. 2d 573, 634 (N.D. Ohio 2003), *aff’d*, 547 F.3d 297 (6th Cir. 2008).

What Defendant, the losing party, has taken to doing, is repeating the same arguments which were previously considered and rejected. Defendant seems to believe that a motion for reconsideration rehashing previously rejected arguments is the remedy for every adverse motion ruling. Defendant’s motion lacks anything that would be sufficient for Fed R. Civ. P. 59(e) reconsideration and instead consists primarily of repeating previously rejected arguments mixed with thinly veiled threats at the justice system, the court, Plaintiff, rambling rhetoric about civil war, and general threats against society in general. There is nothing remotely meritorious within Defendant’s motion, let alone anything rising to the level of a demonstration of a clear error of law, newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law, or the need to prevent

manifest injustice. Defendant's motion can be summarized as, "I don't like Bryan Reo, I don't like anybody linked to him, I don't like Anthony Domenic Reo, I don't like this Court, I don't like society, I am now willing to lie and claim I answered requests for admissions even though there is no record evidence to support such a statement and the record evidence actually shows that I did not answer said requests for admissions, I demand reconsideration." Assuming arguendo the truth of all of Defendant's random racial and sexual slurs against Plaintiff and Plaintiff's Counsel, none of that would rise to the level of serving as a sufficient basis for reconsideration.

Defendant further denigrates the Court in perhaps his most vile diatribe yet, with such language as "it was only on a technicality that John R. Adams didn't get sent to the nuthouse like Pastor Lindstedt." (ECF No. 46, PageID #622). The language used on PageID #624 is so disgusting and wretched that it not only does merit being repeated in this brief [nor will it be] but it is so contemptible and such an affront against this Court that it cries out for Defendant to be immediately jailed.

Defendant's assertion that he answered requests for admissions by answering the complaint and pleading a counter-claim is absurd and legally insufficient. Defendant's Answer and Counter-claim was filed 11/15/2019 (ECF No. 4). Requests For Admission, along with other discovery devices, were propounded upon Defendant on 4/29/2020, no responses were ever made by Defendant although he did acknowledge receipt of same by referencing the same in various pleadings and discussing the same on his website. Defendant's assertion that he responded to Requests for Admissions which were not propounded until April 29, 2020, by his Answer and Counter-claim filed November 15, 2019, is not only false and erroneous, it is an impossibility. One

cannot respond to a document that was created and propounded in April, approximately six months prior to the creation and receipt of said document.

Defendant continues to use these proceedings to file things that demonstrate he would never be entitled to the sort of equity he is not merely requesting, but outright demanding. There is no good reason for this Court to reconsider, alter, or amend its order from 4/18/2021 and Defendant certainly has not come up with any good reason.

Plaintiff respectfully prays that this Court will reject all of Defendant's arguments and deny his motion for reconsideration in toto, provide a formal judgment entry as to the judgment of \$500,000.00 in favor of Plaintiff against Defendant, dispose of Defendant's pending counter-claims against Plaintiff, and proceed to expeditiously close this case for good.

Additionally, Defendant, for reasons which should be painfully obvious, belongs in jail for contempt.

Respectfully submitted,

REO LAW, LLC

/S/. BRYAN ANTHONY REO

Bryan Anthony Reo

P.O. Box 5100

Mentor, OH 44061

(P): (440) 313-5893

(E): Reo@ReoLaw.org

Attorney for Plaintiff Anthony Domenic Reo

Dated: May 12, 2021

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Bryan Anthony Reo, affirm that I am counsel of record to a party to the above-captioned civil action, and on May 12, 2021, I served a true and accurate copy the foregoing document upon Martin Lindstedt, 338 Rabbit Track Road, Granby, MO 64844, by placing the same in a First Class postage-prepaid, properly addressed, and sealed envelope and in the United States Mail located in City of Mentor, Lake County, State of Ohio.

I have also electronically filed the foregoing document which should serve notice of the filing of the same upon each party who has appeared through counsel, via the court's electronic filing notification system.

/S/ BRYAN ANTHONY REO

Bryan Anthony Reo

P.O. Box 5100

Mentor, OH 44061

(P): (440) 313-5893

(E): Reo@ReoLaw.org

Attorney for Plaintiff Anthony Domenic Reo

Dated: May 12, 2021