

**COPYRIGHT ROYALTY JUDGES**  
**The Library of Congress**

*In re*

**DISTRIBUTION OF SATELLITE  
ROYALTY FUNDS**

**CONSOLIDATED  
DOCKET NO. 16-CRB-0010 SD  
(2014-17)**

---

**ORDER DENYING POWELL MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

On September 28, 2019, Mr. David Powell, a pro se participant in the instant proceeding, filed with the Copyright Royalty Judges (Judges) a document captioned “Immediate Breach motion reconsideration to Joint Opposition Allocation Phase Parties False Statements and Sham Pleadings Sua Sponte Coercive Relief Damages Granted” ([Motion](#)). It appears to the Judges that Mr. Powell’s motion seeks reconsideration of the Judges’ September 19, 2019 Order denying Mr. Powell’s earlier motion seeking to be added to a repayment agreement executed by other participants in this proceeding. *See Order Denying Powell Motion to be Added to Repayment Agreement* (Sep. 19, 2019) ([September 19 Order](#)).

Although the Judges’ procedural regulations are silent on the standard for reconsideration of a ruling on a motion or other interlocutory ruling, the Judges have previously found that a motion for reconsideration should be granted only where “(1) there has been an intervening change in controlling law; (2) new evidence is available; or (3) there is a need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” *Order Denying SoundExchange’s Motion to Reconsider the Board’s Order Requiring, In Part, the Production of Certain Income Tax Returns*, Docket No. 2005-1 CRB DTRA at 1 (May 3, 2006) (citing *Regency Communications Inc. v. Cleartel Communications, Inc.* 212 F. Supp. 2d 1, 3 (D.D.C. 2002) and *Firestone v. Firestone*, 76 F.3d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1996)); *see also Order Denying IPG Motion to Reconsider Preliminary Hearing Order Relating to Claims Challenged by SDC* at 1 (May 14, 2013).

The Motion fails to meet this standard. The Motion does not direct the Judges’ attention to any intervening change in controlling law. It includes no evidence, new or otherwise.<sup>1</sup> It makes no persuasive argument that the *September 19 Order* contained errors or was otherwise manifestly unjust.

For the foregoing reasons, the Motion is **DENIED**.

**SO ORDERED.**

---

Jesse M. Feder  
Chief Copyright Royalty Judge

DATED: October 22, 2019

---

<sup>1</sup> The Motion makes numerous unsupported suggestions or accusations of misconduct by other parties, Copyright Royalty Board employees, and customer support representatives who assist eCRB users. The Judges cannot and do not credit such unsupported suggestions and accusations.