

Western Caroline Trading Co. v. Philip, 13 ROP 89 (2006)
WESTERN CAROLINE TRADING COMPANY,
Appellant,

v.

**GODWIN PHILIP, ROSE MOSES, NONA NAITO, WILLIANA SHIPRIT, IGNACIO
FRANZ, JULIA HARUO, FULDA NAITO, and GWEN IGNACIO,**
Appellees.

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 04-032
Civil Action No. 00-190

Supreme Court, Appellate Division
Republic of Palau

Decided: March 27, 2006

Counsel for Appellant: David Shadel

Counsel for Appellees: David J. Kirschenheiter

Appeal from the Supreme Court, Trial Division, the Honorable KATHLEEN M. SALII,
Associate Justice, presiding.

BEFORE: ARTHUR NGIRAKLSONG, Chief Justice; LARRY W. MILLER, Associate Justice;
LOURDES F. MATERNE, Associate Justice.

PER CURIAM:

This matter comes before the Court on Appellant's Petition for Rehearing. In the Petition, Appellant Western Caroline Trading Company contends, first, that the Court improperly ruled on the language of the provision, and second, that the concurrence improperly assumes that the note was drafted by WCTC. Although the Court issued an order permitting the Appellees to file a response, they have not done so.

We have previously held that "[p]etitions for rehearing should be granted exceedingly sparingly, and only in those cases where this Court's original decision obviously and demonstrably contains an error of fact or law that draws into question the result of the appeal." *Espangel v. Tirso*, 3 ROP Intrm. 282, 283 (1993). We have carefully reviewed the Petition and the authorities cited therein and find that it does not meet the standard for granting a rehearing. Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the Petition be, and it hereby is, DENIED.