

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF  
GEORGIA, BRUNSWICK DIVISION

Cedrick Frazier and Tamara Frazier v. Southeast Georgia Health  
System, Inc.; Sherman A. Stevenson, M.D.; and Cooperative  
Healthcare Services, Inc. d/b/a Southeast Georgia Physician  
Associates—Ear, Nose, & Throat

Frazier · No. CV 221-021 · Decided February 18, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia denies the plaintiffs’ renewed motion to disqualify the judge and, to the extent applicable, their request for reconsideration. The court relies on its prior orders and explains the standards governing reconsideration of an order.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, Brunswick Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Lisa Godbey Wood                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, Brunswick Division                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| DECIDED               | February 18, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DOCKET                | CV 221-021                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiffs filed a post-judgment motion seeking to re-raise the disqualification of the undersigned judge and, to the extent applicable, seeking reconsideration of prior orders.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | A motion for reconsideration may be granted based on an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, or the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice. The movant must present facts or law of a strongly convincing nature, and reconsideration may not be used to relitigate old matters or raise arguments or evidence that could have been presented earlier. |
| PRECEDENTIAL VALUE    | unpublished district court order                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

## PARTIES

Cedrick Frazier, Tamara Frazier v. Southeast Georgia Health System, Inc., Sherman A. Stevenson, M.D., Cooperative Healthcare Services, Inc. d/b/a Southeast Georgia Physician Associates—Ear, Nose, & Throat

## TOPICS

motion for reconsideration

civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

federal judicial disqualification

post-judgment motions

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs could re-raise the previously denied motion to disqualify the undersigned judge.
2. Whether plaintiffs were entitled to reconsideration of the prior orders.

## HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs' attempt to re-raise the disqualification issue was denied for the reasons stated in the court's prior orders.
2. Reconsideration was denied because plaintiffs did not establish an intervening change in controlling law, newly available evidence, clear error, or manifest injustice, and reconsideration cannot be used to relitigate old matters or present arguments or evidence that could have been raised earlier.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“District courts in this Circuit have identified three grounds for relief that merit reconsideration of an order: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; and (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.”*

*“A motion for reconsideration cannot be used to ‘relitigate old matters, raise argument or present evidence that could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment.’”*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs had previously moved to disqualify the district judge, and that motion was denied. They then filed a 128-page submission seeking to re-raise the disqualification issue. The court also treated the filing, to the extent applicable, as a motion for reconsideration of its prior orders.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs' earlier motion to disqualify the undersigned judge had been denied in prior orders. Plaintiffs subsequently filed a 128-page submission attempting to re-raise the disqualification issue and potentially seek reconsideration. The district court denied the filing and any request for reconsideration.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Gold Cross EMS, Inc. v. Children's Hosp. of Ala., 108 F. Supp. 3d 1376, 1379 (S.D. Ga. 2015)
- Cover v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 148 F.R.D. 294, 294 (M.D. Fla. 1993)
- Wilchombe v. TeeVee Toons, Inc., 555 F.3d 949, 957 (11th Cir. 2009)
- Michael Linet, Inc. v. Vill. of Wellington, 408 F.3d 757, 763 (11th Cir. 2005)

## OPINION

In the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia Brunswick Division CEDRICK FRAZIER and TAMARA FRAZIER, Plaintiffs, CV 221-021 v. SOUTHEAST GEORGIA HEALTH SYSTEM, INC; SHERMAN A. STEVENSON, M.D.; and COOPERATIVE HEALTHCARE SERVICES, INC. d/b/a SOUTHEAST GEORGIA PHYSICIAN ASSOCIATES-EAR, NOSE, & THROAT, Defendants. ORDER Plaintiffs' Motion to Disqualify the undersigned, dkt. no. 333, has been denied, dkt. nos. 354, 355.

Shortly thereafter, Plaintiffs seek to "re-raise" the disqualification issue in a 128-page filing. Dkt. No. 356. The "re-raised" motion is DENIED for the reasons stated in the Court's prior Orders.<sup>1</sup> Dkt. Nos. 354, 355. <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs continue to file multiple post-judgment motions, often revisiting rejected contentions. See, e.g., Dkt. Nos. 325, 328, 338, 351.

In one such motion titled "Plaintiffs' Rule 11 Motion for Sanctions & Default Judgment Regarding Defense Counsels' Reference to an 'Afternoon' Encounter Based on an Admitted Falsified and Backdated Record Used to Cover Up Malpractice, Constituting a Felony Under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1035 and 1047, and Memorandum in Support," dkt. no. 351, Plaintiffs speculate that my spouse, a retired FBI agent, may be "hindering To the extent Plaintiffs' motion is an attempt to request reconsideration, that request is DENIED.

District courts in this Circuit have identified three grounds for relief that merit reconsideration of an order: "(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; and (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice." Gold Cross EMS, Inc. v. Children's Hosp. of Ala., 108 F. Supp. 3d 1376, 1379 (S.D. Ga. 2015) (citations omitted). "A movant must 'set forth facts or law of a strongly convincing nature to induce the court to reverse its prior decision.'" Id. (quoting Cover v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., 148 F.R.D.

294, 294 (M.D. Fla. 1993)). "A motion for reconsideration cannot be used to 'relitigate old matters, raise argument or present evidence that could have been raised prior to the entry of judgment.'" Wilchombe v. TeeVee Toons, Inc., 555 F.3d 949, 957 (11th Cir. 2009) (quoting

Michael Linet, Inc. v. Vill. of Wellington, 408 F.3d 757, 763 (11th Cir. 2005)). Plaintiffs' "re-raised" motion, dkt. no. 356, is DENIED.

SO ORDERED, this 18th day of February, 2026. HON. LISA GODBEY WOOD, JUDGE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA Attorney, who have refused to indict or prosecute Dr. Stevenson and others...." Dkt. No. 351 at 23.

To the extent this speculation forms a new claim of bias or alleged ground for