

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO
Judge Raymond P. Moore**

Civil Case No. 11-cv-01899-RM-KLM

GERALD LEE PATTERSON,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEORGE SANTINI, M.D.,
CAMACHO, P.A., and
FIVE JOHN/JANE DOES,

Defendants.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION (ECF NO. 105)

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification seeking an order to "clarify" a certain Stipulation of Compromise Settlement ("Stipulation"). (ECF No. 105.) The Court is mindful that Plaintiff proceeds *pro se* and reviews his papers liberally and holds them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972); *Trackwell v. United States Govt.*, 472 F.3d 1242, 1243 (10th Cir. 2007). Nonetheless, in the Motion, Plaintiff argues summarily the Stipulation he entered into was made under duress but fails to provide any specifics or support. Plaintiff also contends that he did not have an opportunity to consult with counsel but he has no counsel in this matter and fails to substantiate such contention. As such, the requested order for the parties/counsel to provide a clarification of the Stipulation cannot be sustained. Correspondingly, to the extent that

Plaintiff also requests the reopening of this administratively closed case based on such arguments, they are insufficient to show good cause. *See* D.C.COLO.LCivR 41.2. It is therefore ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Clarification (ECF No. 105) is DENIED.

DATED this 9th day of June, 2014.

BY THE COURT:



RAYMOND P. MOORE
United States District Judge