

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Chief Judge Wiley Y. Daniel

Civil Action No. 10-cv-01853-WYD-BNB

SANFORD B. SCHUPPER,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBYN CAFASSO, in his individual and official capacity,
WILLIAM EDIE, in his individual and official capacity,
JEANIE SMITH, in her individual and official capacity,
DAVID ZOOK, in his individual and official capacity,
JOHN NEWSOME, in his individual and official capacity,
DAN MAY, in his individual and official capacity,
LINDA DIX, in her individual and official capacity,
RAYMOND SANTISTEVAN, in his individual and official capacity,
RONALD WILKINS, in his individual and official capacity,
ANDREA WALTON, in her individual and official capacity,
DEBBI PARR, in her individual and official capacity,
JOHN RUSZCZYK, in his individual and official capacity, and
JOHN DOE, JANE DOES, DOES 1 - X,

Defendants.

ORDER

THIS MATTER is before the Court on two pending motions: Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification and Correction of 14 February 2012 Order filed February 27, 2012 and Plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of 17 January 2012 Magistrate [Judge's] Order and Underlying Motions Thereof and Review Thereof by Three-Judge Panel" filed February 21, 2012. I first address Plaintiff's February 27, 2012 motion.

Plaintiff's motion filed February 27 requests clarification of the correct date Plaintiff was to file his motion for reconsideration" per the February 14, 2012 Order,

since the Order contains two different dates. The correct date for the filing of the motion for reconsideration is March 13, 2012. To the extent Plaintiff now requests an extension of that date, this request is granted. Plaintiff has up to and including 45 days from the date he receives copies of documents from the Clerk's Office that were ordered to be sent to Plaintiff per the February 14, 2012 Order. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification and Correction of 14 February 2012 Order is granted.

I now turn to the "Motion for Reconsideration of 17 January 2012 Magistrate [Judge's] Order and Underlying Motions Thereof and Review Thereof by Three-Judge Panel." This motion is denied. Plaintiff is not entitled in this Court to review of his case by a three panel judge. To the extent the motion purports to be an objection to Magistrate Judge Boland's January 12, 2012 Order or other orders, I find no basis to the objection and note that the objection is largely unintelligible. The pages do not correspond with each other and it is difficult to determine what Plaintiff is arguing or seeking from the Court. Further, Plaintiff can address his concerns regarding substantive rulings in the case in his motion for reconsideration.

Based on the foregoing, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff's "Motion for Clarification and Correction of 14 February 2012 Order" filed February 27, 2012 (ECF No. 109) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff has 45 days after receipt of documents ordered to be provided to him from the Clerk's Office to file a motion for reconsideration of the Court's March 2, 2011, Order. It is

FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's "Motion for Reconsideration of 17 January 2012 Magistrate [Judge's] Order and Underlying Motions Thereof and Review Thereof by Three-Judge Panel" filed February 21, 2012 (ECF No. 108) is **DENIED**.

Dated: February 28, 2012

BY THE COURT:

s/ Wiley Y. Daniel
Wiley Y. Daniel
Chief United States District Judge