

Plaintiff cites in support Third Circuit caselaw that states that Rule 59(e) is used to relitigate issues that have been decided, when there has been (1) an intervening change in the law, (2) new evidence, or (3) a clear error of law. Plaintiff does not seriously argue the first two.¹ But it could be said, interpreting her motion generously in light of her *pro se* status, that she was arguing a clear error of law. But, as her brief makes clear, her argument is that other tribunals erred in invalidating her patent claims and holding that she was collaterally estopped. That is not the sort of allegation of clear error of law that I can entertain on a Rule 59(e) motion. Even if I could, the Court of Appeals' dismissal of the appeal as frivolous makes clear that there is no basis for the argument that there was a clear error of law.

Plaintiff offers no argument in regard to Rule 60(b), and it is apparent that there is no basis to grant such relief.

Plaintiff's motion to reconsider (D.I. 103) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of December 2020.

/s/ Richard G. Andrews
United States District Judge

¹ She states there has been an intervening change in the law, citing among others, Supreme Court cases from more than 200 years ago, as well as other cases that predate my decision. (D.I. 103 at 6).