

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

WO

MDR

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Loretta Ann Greer,
Plaintiff,

vs.

City of Goodyear, et al.,
Defendants.

No. CV 10-1050-PHX-JAT (LOA)

ORDER

In a June 24, 2010 Order, the Court dismissed this case under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) because Plaintiff Loretta Ann Greer had not paid the filing fee, had three “strikes,” and had not made a credible allegation in her four-count Complaint that she was in imminent danger of serious physical injury and had not demonstrated a nexus between an alleged imminent danger and her claims. Because the Court dismissed the Complaint, the Court denied as moot Plaintiff’s “Motion for Emergenc[y] TRO Injunction.” The Clerk of Court entered Judgment on June 24, 2010.

On July 6, 2010, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Recon[s]ideration Attorney and Enlarg[e]ment.” In a July 12, 2010 Order, the Court denied the Motion.

On July 26, 2010, Plaintiff filed a “Motion for Recon[s]ideration Attorney and Enlarg[e]ment”(Doc. 16) that is virtually identical to her July 6th Motion and filed a “Memo of Law Supporting Motion for Recon[s]ideration[,] Attorney[,] Exhibits, Declaration Combined” (Doc. 17). The Court has reviewed Plaintiff’s second Motion for


1 Reconsideration and her Memo. Plaintiff has presented nothing different than she presented
2 in her first Motion for Reconsideration. For the same reasons stated in the Court's July 12,
3 2010 Order, the Court will deny Plaintiff's second Motion for Reconsideration.

4 **IT IS ORDERED:**

5 (1) Plaintiff's second "Motion for Recon[s]ideration Attorney and Enlarg[e]ment"
6 (Doc. 16) is **denied**.

7 (2) This case must remain **closed**.

8 DATED this 28th day of July, 2010.

9
10
11 
12 James A. Teilborg
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28