

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
TEXARKANA DIVISION

ALISA NELSON

PLAINTIFF

vs.

Case No. 4:16-cv-04009

CITY OF HOPE, *et al*

DEFENDANTS

ORDER

BEFORE the Court is Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration of All Orders and to Appoint Counsel. ECF No. 30. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and (3) (2005), United States District Judge Susan O. Hickey referred this Motion to the undersigned for decision. The Court having reviewed the pleadings, finds Plaintiff's Motion For Reconsideration of All Orders and to Appoint Counsel (ECF No. 30), should be **DENIED**.

Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se* in this matter. Plaintiff's allegations against Defendant involve complaints of damage to Plaintiff's property from flooding as a result of Defendant's failure to construct a proper drainage system. ECF No. 1. With this Motion, Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of previous orders, a renewed Motion to Appoint Counsel, and what appears to be a Motion to Compel discovery answers.

Plaintiff has not indicated what previous Orders should be reconsidered, nor has Plaintiff provided any basis to the Court by which the Orders should be reconsidered. Accordingly, to the extent Plaintiff requests reconsideration of prior Orders of this Court the request is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff also renews a request for the Appointment of Counsel. Plaintiff initially filed a Motion for Appointment of Counsel on November 23, 2016. ECF No. 20. This Court denied the Motion on December 6, 2016. ECF No. 22. Plaintiff has not provided any new basis to reconsider

the previous denial for appointment of counsel. This request is **DENIED**.

Finally, this Motion seems to request that Defendant answer outstanding discovery requests sent by Plaintiff. This Court will treat this a Motion to Compel. Local Rule 7.2(g) requires “[a]ll motions to compel discovery and all other discovery-enforcement motions and all motions for protective orders *shall contain a statement by the moving party that the parties have conferred in good faith on the specific issue or issues in dispute* and that they are not able to resolve their disagreements without the intervention of the Court.” (emphasis added).” Plaintiff did not comply with Local Rule 7.2(g) prior to filing this Motion. Plaintiff is directed to confer with opposing counsel to attempt to resolve any discovery dispute prior to seeking Court intervention.

Accordingly, Plaintiff’s Motion For Reconsideration of All Orders and to Appoint Counsel (ECF No. 30) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED this **16th day of February 2017**.

s/ Barry A. Bryant
HON. BARRY A. BRYANT
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE