

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
ROCK ISLAND DIVISION**

LORAS L. STEINES, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
)  
v. )  
)  
DONALD P. WELVAERT, *Mayor of* )  
*Moline, Illinois*, JEFF TERRONEZ, *Rock* )  
*Island County States' Attorney*, LISA )  
MADIGAN, *Illinois Attorney General*, )  
KIM HANKINS, *Chief of Moline Police* )  
*Department*, JEROME PATRICK, )  
*Captain of Moline Police*, TREVOR FISK, )  
*Captain of Moline Police*, TIMOTHY )  
WALTMAN, *Moline Police Officer*, )  
SCOTT WILLIAMS, *Moline Police* )  
*Officer*, MARK SENKO, *Rock Island* )  
*County Assistant States Attorney*, FRANK )  
R. FUHR, *Judge*, PHILLIP KOENIG, )  
*Attorney of Law*, JOHN DOAK, *Attorney* )  
*of Law*, TOM GOCHANOUR, *Moline* )  
*Crime Watcher and Petitioner in Case #* )  
*10 OP 599 and 10 OP 600*, LINDA )  
GOCHANOUR, *Moline Crime Watcher* )  
*and Petitioner in Case # 10 OP 599 and* )  
*10 OP 600*, )  
)  
Defendants. )

Case No. 11-cv-4012

**ORDER & OPINION**

On February 23, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Complaint (Doc. 1), Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Doc. 2) and Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 3). Plaintiff sought to file claims against over sixteen defendants for alleged violations of his constitutional rights. After ordering Plaintiff to supplement his Motion for Leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Text Order of 3/17/2011), the Court

engaged in a review of Plaintiff's Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) and found that Plaintiff had failed to state any cognizable claim. (Doc. 6 at 2). Further, the Court denied Petitioner's Motion for Leave to Proceed in forma pauperis, finding that he had sufficient funds to pay the applicable filing fees. (Doc. 6 at 3). Accordingly, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint, and held that in order to re-file any Complaint with this Court, he must first pay the applicable filing fee. (Doc. 6 at 3). Because his Complaint had been dismissed, the Court also found Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel to be moot. (Doc. 6 at 3).

Plaintiff has now filed three additional motions with the Court: 1) Motion to Request the Court to Reconsider Its Decision to Dismiss Plaintiff's Complaint (Doc. 8); 2) Motion to Request the Court to Reconsider Its Decision to Deny Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 9); and 3) Motion to Request the Court to Reconsider Its Decision that Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel was Rendered Moot (Doc. 10). In his Motion seeking reconsideration of his status as indigent, Plaintiff provides no reason why the Court erred in its initial determination that he can indeed pay the applicable filing fees. Therefore, his Motion to Reconsider the Court's Denial of his Motion to Proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 9) is DENIED. Accordingly, as the Court directed in its previous Order and Opinion, Plaintiff may re-file a Complaint in this Court in which he adequately states a claim for relief, but only if he first pays the applicable filing fees. Because Plaintiff has not done so, his other two Motions for Reconsideration (Docs. 8 & 10) are also DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Entered this 10th day of June, 2011.

s/ Joe B. McDade  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOE BILLY McDADE  
United States Senior District Judge