## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 08-cv-02829-BNB

FELICIA WALKER,

Plaintiff.

٧.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DENVER, COLORADO

APR 2-2 2009

GREGORY C. LANGHAM
CLERK

ARI ZAVARAS, Executive Director, CECILIA LOPEZ, Medical Staff, MS. SHOEMAKER, Medical Director DOC, and COLORADO DEPT. OF CORRECTIONS,

Defendants.

## ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Plaintiff Felicia Walker, a State of Colorado prisoner, has filed two *pro se* Letters addressing the April 1, 2009, Order of Dismissal. The Court must construe the Letters liberally because Ms. Walker is a *pro se* litigant. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); *Hall v. Belimon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991).

In the April 9, 2009, Letter, Ms. Walker states that prison staff knew she had a deadline to submit her initial partial filing fee to the Court, but they were delinquent in processing her request for a money order. Ms. Walker further states that she did not believe she needed to ask for an extension of time to submit the payment, because she had told the captains that she had a deadline. Ms. Walker also contends that the instant case should not be dismissed because of prison staff's inaction.

In the April 13, 2009, Letter, Ms. Walker attaches a copy of a second request for a money order that she submitted for a money order to be sent to the Court. Ms. Walker again claims that the DOC prison staff is responsible for the delay in processing her request for a money order.

A litigant subject to an adverse judgment, and who seeks reconsideration by the district court of that adverse judgment, may "file either a motion to alter or amend the judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) or a motion seeking relief from the judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)." *Van Skiver v. United States*, 952 F.2d 1241, 1243 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1991). Ms. Walker submitted the Motion within ten days after the Order of Dismissal and the Judgment were entered in the instant action. The Court, therefore, will construe the Letter as a Motion to Reconsider filed pursuant to Rule 59(e). *See Van Skiver*, 952 F.2d at 1243.

In the April 1, 2009, Order of Dismissal, the Court dismissed the action because Ms. Walker failed within the time allowed to comply with Magistrate Judge Boland's February 12, 2009, Order by either paying the initial partial filing fee or in the alternative showing cause why she has no assets and no means by which to pay the designated fee. Ms. Walker was given thirty days to comply with the February 12, 2009, Order. Ms. Walker is responsible for informing the Court of any inability to comply with a court order within the specified time.

Ms. Walker concedes that she knew she was not able to obtain the money order within the time allowed. Ms. Walker was given more than thirty days to comply before the action was dismissed. Even after the thirty days had passed, she still failed to

inform the Court of her inability to comply with the February 12, 2009, Order. The Court, therefore, concludes that Ms. Walker fails to demonstrate some reason why the Court should reconsider and vacate the April 1, 2009, Order of Dismissal. Ms. Walker is reminded that the instant action was dismissed without prejudice, and she may, if she desires, seek to file a new action. Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that the Letters (Docs. # 11 and # 12) are construed as a Motion to Reconsider, filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). It is

FURTHER ORDERED that the Motion to Reconsider is DENIED.

DATED at Denver, Colorado, this 22 day of \_

2009.

BY THE COURT:

ZITA L. WEINSHIENK, Senior Judge

∕United States District Court

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

## **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

Civil Action No. 08-cv-02829-ZLW

Felicia Walker Prisoner No. 135374 Denver Women's Corr. Facility PO Box 392005 Denver, CO 80239

GREGORY C/LANGHAM, CLERK

By: Deputy Clerk