

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, MACON DIVISION

Michael Joel Rozier v. McCalla Raymer Leibert Pierce LLC, et al.

No. 5:25-cv-295 (MTT), United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Macon Division
(February 6, 2026)

SUMMARY

The court denied Michael Joel Rozier's motions for reconsideration of orders denying his motion for a temporary restraining order and dismissing his claims against New American Funding. The court held that Rozier did not establish an intervening change in law, newly discovered evidence, or clear legal error, and rejected his sovereign-citizen and standing arguments as meritless.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Macon Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Marc T. Treadwell
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, Macon Division
DECIDED	February 6, 2026
DOCKET	5:25-cv-295 (MTT)
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for reconsideration of orders denying his motion for a temporary restraining order and dismissing his claims against New American Funding.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy appropriate only upon an intervening change in law, newly discovered evidence previously unavailable through due diligence, or clear error of law. A motion may not simply restate prior arguments, and arguments inadvertently omitted earlier are deemed waived.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- standing
- mortgages
- sanctions

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

constitutional law

real estate

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Rozier demonstrated a basis under Local Rule 7.6 for reconsideration of the order denying his motion for a temporary restraining order.
2. Whether Rozier demonstrated clear error in the order dismissing his claims against New American Funding by arguing that the defendant lacked standing to enforce a void debt and that the mortgage was a nullity.

HOLDINGS

1. Reconsideration was unwarranted because Rozier did not identify an intervening change in law, newly discovered evidence, or clear error of law.
2. Rozier did not establish clear error in the dismissal order; his contention that New American Funding lacked standing was legally meritless because New American Funding was the defendant Rozier sued.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.”

“It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.””

“the Court will not tolerate sovereign citizen theories, which are uniformly rejected as meritless.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Rozier sought a temporary restraining order and separately asserted claims against New American Funding concerning an alleged void debt or mortgage. After the court denied the TRO and dismissed the claims against New American Funding, Rozier moved for reconsideration, invoking purported restrictions on state jurisdiction over Indigenous persons and arguing that New American Funding lacked standing to enforce a void debt.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously denied Rozier's motion for a temporary restraining order and dismissed his claims against New American Funding. Rozier filed motions for reconsideration under Federal Rule? No federal rule was identified in the opinion; the court analyzed the motions under Middle District of Georgia Local Rule 7.6 and denied both motions.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Bingham v. Nelson, 2010 WL 339806, at *1 (M.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2010)
- McCoy v. Macon Water Authority, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997)
- United States v. Studley, 783 F.2d 934, 937 n.3 (9th Cir. 1986)

OPINION

ROZIER

PER CURIAM.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

MACON DIVISION

MICHAEL JOEL ROZIER,)

)) Plaintiff,)) v.) CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:25-cv-295 (MTT))

MCCALLA RAYMER LEIBERT)

PIERCE LLC, et al.,)) Defendants.))

ORDER

Plaintiff Michael Rozier moves the Court for reconsideration of its Order denying his motion for a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) (ECF 28) and Order dismissing Rozier’s claims against Defendant New American Funding (ECF 41). ECF 32; 43. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.6, “Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.” M.D. Ga. L.R. 7.6. Indeed, “reconsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.” Bingham v. Nelson, 2010 WL 339806 at *1 (M.D. Ga. Jan. 21, 2010) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). It “is appropriate only if the movant demonstrates (1) that there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) that new evidence has been discovered which was not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or (3) that the court made a clear error of law.” Id. “In order to demonstrate clear error, the party moving for reconsideration must do more than simply restate his prior arguments, and any arguments which the party inadvertently failed to raise earlier are deemed waived.” McCoy v. Macon Water Authority, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222-23 (M.D. Ga. 1997). In Rozier’s motion for reconsideration of the Court’s Order denying his motion for a TRO, Rozier argues that he has filed a Notice of Removal and “invokes protections ... which restricts state jurisdiction over Indigenous persons absent consent.” ECF 32 at 1. Rozier does not attempt to demonstrate any appropriate basis for reconsideration as described above, and thus his motion for reconsideration (ECF 32) is DENIED. In his motion for reconsideration of the Court’s Order dismissing his claims against New American Funding, Rozier argues (1) the Court erred by not addressing the threshold issue of standing based on a void contract; (2) the Court’s “failure to state a claim” analysis is moot if the defendant lacks standing to enforce a void debt; and (3) “the ‘mortgage’ is a nullity, a ‘dead pledge,’ securing nothing.” ECF 43. Rozier appears to assert that the Court made a clear error of law. However, his argument

that Defendant New American Funding, who Rozier sued, “lacks standing,” is nonsensical. Rozier is again reminded that the Court will not tolerate sovereign citizen theories, which are uniformly rejected as meritless. Moreover, “advancement of such utterly meritless arguments is now the basis for serious sanctions imposed on civil litigants who raise them.” *United States v. Studley*, 783 F.2d 934, 937 n.3 (9th Cir. 1986). Because Rozier has failed to show that the Court made a clear error in its previous Order (ECF 41), his motion for reconsideration (ECF 43) is DENIED. SO ORDERED, this 6th day of February, 2026. S/ Marc T. Treadwell

MARC T. TREADWELL, JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT