

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS  
CENTRAL DIVISION

SADRUD-DIN SIDDIQ, JR

PLAINTIFF

v.

No. 4:24-cv-495-DPM

TOLLETT, Officer; BOYD, Det.;  
PERICHI, Sgt.; WARD, Officer;  
and CHRISTPHOR, Officer

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

Siddiq's original complaint was short on details. The Court ordered an amended complaint with more information about his potential claims. Siddiq filed an amended complaint but did not provide sufficient information to state a claim. The Court dismissed his case without prejudice. Siddiq moves to reconsider—now offering details about which officers did what.

The motion, *Doc. 7*, is denied for two reasons. First, in general one can't use a motion to reconsider to make arguments or offer facts that were available but not explained before the Court entered Judgment. *Arnold v. ADT Security Services, Inc.*, 627 F.3d 716, 721 (8th Cir. 2010). Second, Siddiq still has not stated a plausible claim under federal law. He notes that various Little Rock police officers gave him the run-around and failed to investigate adequately his girlfriend's 2022 disappearance and possible kidnapping. An officer's negligence in

performing his duty, though, does not alone violate the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution. *Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327, 328 (1986).

So Ordered.

*D.P. Marshall Jr.*  
D.P. Marshall Jr.  
United States District Judge

*24 October 2024*