

STATE OF INDIANA)
)
COUNTY OF LAKE)

LAKE SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL DIVISION, ROOM SEVEN
CROWN POINT, INDIANA
Cause # 45D11-2512-MI-00644

ANGELITA SORIANO, ALBINA)
VENEGAS-ROMAN, BARBARA)
KOTELES, and JOSEPH CONN)
 Plaintiffs)
vs.)
CITY OF HOBART PLAN COMMISSION)
and COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY)
OF HOBART, INDIANA)
 Defendants)
)
HOBART OWNER LLC, AMAZON)
DATA SERVICES INC, and TUHAUS)
LLC)
 Intervenors)

Filed in Open Court

APR 13 2026

Bree P.P.
JUDGE
SUPERIOR COURT OF LAKE COUNTY

ORDER ON MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The Plaintiffs, ANGELITA SORIANO, ALBINA VENEGAS-ROMAN, BARBARA KOTELES, and JOSEPH CONN (hereinafter together "PLAINTIFFS"), filed a motion for reconsideration of this Court's Order on Petition for Preliminary Injunction entered on March 26, 2026, on April 6, 2026. Intervenor, HOBART OWNER LLC (hereinafter "LAND OWNER"), filed a response in opposition on April 9, 2026 and the Defendants, CITY OF HOBART PLAN COMMISSION and COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HOBART, INDIANA (hereinafter together "DEFENDANTS"), filed a response in opposition on April 10, 2026 and the PLAINTIFFS filed a reply on April 9, 2026. The Court read each of the foregoing, re-read its Order of March 26, 2026 and, since no party requested a hearing, found and Ordered:

1. This Court's Order on Petition for Preliminary Injunction entered on March 26, 2026, *inter alia*, found and Ordered:
 - A. The PLAINTIFFS' had standing to contest the present issues.

- B. Denied the motions for judgment on the evidence filed by both the DEFENDANTS and by the LAND OWNER.
 - C. Granted the partial motions to dismiss / motions to bar filed by both the DEFENDANTS and by the LAND OWNER based upon the PLAINTIFFS' failure to exhaust all of their administrative remedies.
 - D. Granted the motions to dismiss / motions to bar filed by both the DEFENDANTS and by the LAND OWNER based upon the PLAINTIFFS' failure to timely file the board record.
 - E. Found that it never reached the issue of the proposed preliminary injunction, as it was without jurisdiction to rule on this issue.
- 2. A trial court has the inherent power to reconsider any previous ruling so long as the action remains pending before the Court. *Kroger Limited Partnership I v. Lomax*, 141 N.E.3d 46, 49 at footnote 6 (Ind. Ct. App. 2020).
 - 3. Reconsideration of an interlocutory order may be appropriate when the court has patently misunderstood a party. *Patrick v. Cowen*, 2017 WL 993067 (N.D. Indiana, March 15, 2017)(citing *Bank of Waunakee v. Rochester Cheese Sales Inc*, 906 F.2d 1185, 1191 (7th Cir. 1990).
 - 4. A motion to reconsider is to be granted only in . . . extraordinary circumstances; indeed, the court's orders are not mere first drafts, subject to revision, and reconsideration at a litigant's pleasure. *Patrick v. Cowen* at 1.
 - 5. This judicial officer is confident that he understood the PLAINTIFFS' motion that precipitated this Court's Order on Petition for Preliminary Injunction entered on March 26, 2026.
 - 6. Here, the PLAINTIFFS made arguments identical to those made by them in their briefs of February 5, 2026 and March 4, 2026, and in their oral argument of March 9, 2026.
 - 7. With nothing new from the PLAINTIFFS, the Court again **DENIED**, the PLAINTIFFS' argument, and **DENIED** their motion to reconsider.
 - 8. Any and all motions or requests of any party, not specifically ruled upon herein, was **DENIED**.

APR 13 2026

SO ORDERED this _____.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bruce D. Parent', with a stylized flourish at the end.

JUDGE BRUCE D. PARENT
Lake Superior Court, Civil Room Seven

Soriano, et al v Hobart, et al
Order on Motion to Reconsider
Page 3 of 3