

EXHIBIT T

TNMD DOC 245 — ORDER DENYING RULE 59 RELIEF

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE**

Jeffrey Ryan Fenton,	)	CASE NO. 3: 24 CV 1282
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	JUDGE PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN
	)	
v.	)	
	)	<u>Order</u>
Virginia Lee Story, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

On March 26, 2025, this Court issued a Memorandum of Opinion and Order and entered judgment dismissing this action. Plaintiff has filed an “Objection” to the Court’s Memorandum of Opinion and Order and judgment and “Motion” pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59 to Alter Judgement or For a New Trial (“Objection and Motion”). (Doc. No. 238.) For the following reasons, Plaintiff’s Objection and Motion is DENIED.

The disposition of a motion to alter or amend a judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) is entrusted to the discretion of the district court. *Huff v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co.*, 675 F.2d 119, 122 (6th Cir. 1982). Such motions are generally only granted when there is: (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. *Intera Corp. v. Henderson*, 428 F.3d 605, 620 (6th Cir. 2005).

As Defendants demonstrate in their Responses in Opposition (Doc. Nos. 239-244), Plaintiff’s 64-page Objection and Motion is virtually incomprehensible and does not demonstrate any circumstance warranting relief from the Court’s judgment under Rule 59(e), and nothing in his Objection and Motion alters the Court’s conclusion that this action was

properly dismissed.

Accordingly, for these reasons and those stated by Defendants in their filed Responses, Plaintiff's Objection and Motion is denied. The Court further certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Patricia A. Gaughan

PATRICIA A. GAUGHAN

United States District Court Judge

Dated: 5/19/25