

Melaitau v. Lakobong, 9 ROP 192 (2002)
**FRANCISCO MELAITAU, RIUMD MOSES SAM, NGIRAIBAI MASAICHI
ETITERNGEL, SIKESOL INACIO SADANG, SECHARKEBUR NGIRARIKEL
GIDEON, RUSSELL MASAYOS, and LAZARUS INACIO,
Appellants,**

v.

**HILARIA LAKOBONG, DANNY ONGELUNGEL, SUSANA MATSUOKA, BENJAMIN
TEMOL, AUGUSTO RENGUUL,
and JOSEPH TIOBECH,
Appellees.**

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 01-62
Civil Action No. 01-98

Supreme Court, Appellate Division
Republic of Palau

Decided: September 4, 2002

[1] **Appeal and Error:** Petition for Rehearing

Petitions 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.

[2] **Appeal and Error:** Petition for Rehearing

A petition for rehearing shall state with particularity the points of law or fact which in the opinion of the petitioner the Appellate Division has overlooked or misapprehended.

Counsel for Appellants: Mark Doran

Counsel for Appellees: Moses Uludong

BEFORE: LARRY W. MILLER, Associate Justice; DANIEL N. CADRA, Associate Justice Pro Tem; J. UDUCH SENIOR, Associate Justice Pro Tem.

[1, 2] The Court is in receipt of Appellees' petition for rehearing in this case. "We have previously held that petitions 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." *Superluck Enters., Inc. v. ROP*, 7 ROP Intrm. 7 (1998) (internal quotations and citations omitted). ROP Rule of Appellate Procedure 40(a) provides that a petition for rehearing "shall state with particularity the points of law or fact which in the opinion of the petitioner the Appellate Division has overlooked or

Melaitau v. Lakobong, 9 ROP 192 (2002)

misapprehended” Here, petitioners have identified a factual question which they believe was left open by the Court’s opinion of July 24, 2002. They have not, however, explained how a reconsideration of this question has any bearing on the ultimate outcome of this case. Their petition is accordingly denied.