

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

Civil Action No. 13-cv-01369-REB-BNB

LAURENCE R. GOODMAN,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER

Blackburn, J.

This matter is before me on the petitioner's **Motion for Leave To Make a Statement Likely To Manifest a Specific Cause of Action** [#42 & 43]¹ filed October 18, 2013. The motions docketed as [#42] and [#43] appear to be identical. I deny the motions.

The petitioner is acting *pro se*. Therefore, I construe his filings generously and with the leniency due pro se litigants, see ***Erickson v. Pardus***, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007); ***Andrews v. Heaton***, 483 F.3d 1070, 1076 (10th Cir. 2007); ***Hall v. Belmon***, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991) (citing ***Haines v. Kerner***, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972)).

Recently, I entered an order [#40] granting the respondent's motion to dismiss, which resulted in the dismissal of this case. Judgment [#41] entered in favor of the respondent against the petitioner. In his most recent motions, the petitioner asserts that

¹ “[#42]” 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.

he has a valid cause of action and appears to seek reconsideration of my order dismissing this case.

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 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 (10th Cir. 2000) (citations omitted). The petitioner's most recent motions offer nothing suggesting that any of these factors are implicated here. Instead, he merely rehashes arguments previously advanced; arguments which are no more persuasive now than they were before.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the petitioner's **Motion for Leave To Make a Statement Likely To Manifest a Specific Cause of Action** [#42 & 43] filed October 18, 2013, are **DENIED**.

Dated October 21, 2013, at Denver, Colorado.

BY THE COURT:



Robert E. Blackburn
United States District Judge