

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

CARRINGTON COURTNEY,)	CASE NO. 1:16 CV 578
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
)	
CITY OF CLEVELAND., <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	<u>MEMORANDUM OPINION</u>
)	<u>AND ORDER</u>

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff, Carrington Courtney’s Motion for Reconsideration and Written Opposition to Grant of Summary Judgement, (ECF “24), as well as Defendants’ Motion to Strike Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration. (ECF #25).

The Court set an expedited briefing schedule for dispositive motions at a January 3, 2017 status conference. (ECF #20). Plaintiff made no appearance at that status conference. Defendant filed its Motion for Summary Judgment on March 17, 2017. (ECF #19). The Response was originally due on March 20, 2017. (ECF #20). No response was filed. At the next status conference on April 10, 2017, the Plaintiff was given the opportunity to extend the response time, and his counsel represented that no written response would be filed. He chose,

instead, to rely on the pleadings in the file. (ECF #21). The Court ruled on the Summary Judgment motion just over a month later, on June 28, 2017. (ECF #22). At no time in between did Plaintiff seek to file a response to the Summary Judgment motion.

On July 5, 2017, Plaintiff filed his Motion to Reconsider and “written opposition” to the Summary Judgment Order. (ECF #24). To the extent that this two page document purports to be a written opposition to the Summary Judgment motion, it is stricken as untimely. To the extent that it is a Motion to Reconsider the Court’s prior opinion, it is DENIED. There is nothing in this document that would justify reconsideration of this Court’s prior opinion. Defendant’s Motion to Strike, (ECF #25), is GRANTED in part, and Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider, (ECF #24), is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Donald C. Nugent
Donald C. Nugent
United States District Judge

Date: August 11, 2017