

**In re: THE PETITION OF CORNELIUS W. PRATT FOR THE  
RECONSIDERATION OF THE DECISION CANCELING HIS LICENSE.**

Heard: January 5, 1982.

Decided: February 5, 1982.

1. Petition for reconsideration of reargument is allowed only where one of the concurring justices orders the filing of the petition.

During its March, A. D. 1981 Term, the Supreme Court denied petitioner's petition for admission to its Bar; and petitioner filed a petition for reconsideration, but did not obtain the order of one of the concurring justices for the filing. The Supreme Court denied and dismissed the petition for reconsideration.

MR. JUSTICE YANGBE delivered the opinion of the Court.

During the March, A. D. 1981 Term of this Court, we handed down an opinion and judgment denying a petition filed by petitioner for admission to the Bar of this Court as a counsellor-at-law because, among other things, petitioner's admission to the Bar as an attorney-at-law was not in conformity with the law in force. The opinion and judgment were read on the 31st day of July, 1981.

Subsequently, petitioner filed another petition praying for reconsideration of the first decision. The petition for reconsideration was heard on the 5th day of January, 1982, during the current 1981 October Term of this Court, and we reserved our ruling.

There are several questions which presented themselves during the hearing, but the salient issue was and still is: According to the Rules of this Court what is the procedure to be followed as regards rearguments or reconsideration of decisions previously rendered by this Court?

Rule 3 of this Court reads:

"Contents of Petition - The petition shall contain a brief and distinct statement of the grounds upon which it is based, and shall not be heard unless a justice concurring in the judgment shall order it. The moving party shall serve a copy thereof upon the adverse party as provided by the rules relating to motion."

None of the Justices who signed the judgment and concurred in the opinion aforesaid ordered the filing of the petition for reconsideration as required by the statute outlined above. Therefore, the petition for reconsideration was filed without due authority; and thus not in conformity with the rule and practice governing reargument.

In view of the above, we regret our inability to embrace jurisdiction in this matter and the reconsideration of our position previously taken in this case. Accordingly, the petition for reconsideration is denied.

The Clerk of this Court is mandated to strike from the docket of this Court said petition for reconsideration. All costs are charged against the petitioner. And it is so ordered.

Petition for reconsideration denied.

