

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO  
Judge Robert E. Blackburn**

Civil Case No. 10-cv-01118-REB-KMT

THERESA L. DOWLING,

Plaintiff,

v.

STURGEON ELECTRIC,  
WILLIAM LONG, and  
WILLIAM FREDRICKS,

Defendants.

---

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

---

**Blackburn, J.**

The matter before me is the plaintiff's **Motion To Reconsider Order Denying Plaintiff's Amended Objection** [#211]<sup>1</sup> filed December 5, 2011. The plaintiff seeks reconsideration of my **Order Denying Relief Sought in Plaintiff's Amended Objection** [#204] filed November 22, 2011. I deny the motion.<sup>2</sup>

The bases for granting reconsideration are extremely limited:

Grounds warranting a motion to reconsider include (1) an intervening change in the controlling law, (2) new evidence previously unavailable, and (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice. Thus, a motion for

---

<sup>1</sup> “[#211]” is an example of the convention I use to identify the docket number assigned to a specific paper by the court's case management and electronic case filing system (CM/ECF). I use this convention throughout this order.

<sup>2</sup> Because plaintiff is proceeding pro se, I continue to construe her pleadings and other filings more liberally and held them to a less stringent standard than formal pleadings drafted by lawyers. **See *Erickson v. Pardus***, 551 U.S. 89, 94, 127 S. Ct. 2197, 2200, 167 L.Ed.2d 1081 (2007); ***Andrews v. Heaton***, 483 F.3d 1070, 1076 (10th Cir. 2007); ***Hall v. Bellmon***, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991) (citing ***Haines v. Kerner***, 404 U.S. 519,520-21, 92 S.Ct. 594, 595-96, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972)). However, I have not acted as an advocate for the plaintiff.


reconsideration is appropriate where the court has misapprehended the facts, a party's position, or the controlling law. It is not appropriate to revisit issues already addressed or advance arguments that could have been raised in prior briefing.

***Servants of the Paraclete v. Does***, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). In her motion to reconsider [#211], the plaintiff offers nothing claiming or suggesting that any of these factors are implicated in my **Order Denying Relief Sought in Plaintiff's Amended Objection** [#204] filed November 22, 2011.

**THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED** that the plaintiff's **Motion To Reconsider Order Denying Plaintiff's Amended Objection** [#211] filed December 5, 2011, is **DENIED**.

Dated December 8, 2011, at Denver, Colorado.

**BY THE COURT:**

  
Robert E. Blackburn  
United States District Judge