

already decided.” Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir.1995). Thus, the standard governing motions for reconsideration is strict and “reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked-matters ... that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.” Id.

Day Kimball fails to justify reconsideration of the court’s Ruling. It does not cite any newly discovered evidence or intervening change in the law governing the plaintiff’s EMTALA claim; nor does it point out evidence or case law that the court overlooked in deciding the earlier motion. Instead, Day Kimball argues simply that the court erred in finding a disputed issue of material fact as to whether the plaintiff received an appropriate medical screening examination under EMTALA. See Mot. for Recons. at 2. This is an attempt to re-litigate a matter already decided. See Ruling Re: Mot. For Summ. J. at 5-12 (featuring a lengthy discussion of this issue). Accordingly, the Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. No. 183) is **denied**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 6th day of October, 2011.

/s/ Janet C. Hall
Janet C. Hall
United States District Judge