

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

PAUL DANIEL REEDER,	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	CIVIL ACTION NO.
v.	:	3:05-CV-1532 (JCH)
	:	
STATE OF CONNECTICUT,	:	NOVEMBER 3, 2009
Defendant.	:	

RULING RE: MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (Doc. No. 31)

Paul Reeder (“Reeder”), the plaintiff in this case, filed a Motion for Reconsideration on October 1, 2009 (Doc. No. 31). For the reasons that follow, the Motion is denied.

While the Motion is not entirely clear as to what Reeder wishes this court to reconsider, the court construes the Motion as urging reconsideration of this court’s October 20, 2008 Order (Doc. No. 30) (hereinafter “October 20 Order”) denying two earlier motions for injunctive relief filed by Reeder (Doc. Nos. 28, 29). The court construes the Motion in this manner because it states, “I don’t know what special characters have been removed,” apparently in response to text appearing in the docket entry accompanying the October 20 order (“Modified on 10/27/2008 to remove special characters in text.”).

This case is closed. The court entered judgment for the defendant in this matter on May 26, 2006 (Doc. No. 14). While Reeder thereafter filed a Motion for New Trial (Doc. No. 16), a Corrected Motion (Doc. No. 17) and a Second Corrected Motion (Doc. No. 18), the court denied those motions on June 28, 2007 (Doc. No. 24). The court also denied subsequent motions for injunctive relief on June 17, 2008 and, as stated above, on October 20, 2008. Under Local Rule of Civil Procedure 7(c), Motions for

Reconsideration “shall be filed and served within ten (10) days of the filing of the decision or order from which relief is sought.” In this case, the court’s most recent order was issued more than eleven months prior to October 1, 2009, the date on which Reeder filed the instant Motion for Reconsideration.

The court notes that Reeder’s Motion for Reconsideration references an “Appeals Packet Transmittal.” Mot. for Reconsideration at 4. However, the docket report does not indicate that Reeder has ever filed a Notice of Appeal in this case. If Reeder believes he has grounds on which to appeal one or more of the court’s previous rulings in this case, he may attempt to do so by filing a Notice of Appeal. However, based on the dates referenced above, it appears likely that he is out of time.

Reeder’s Motion for Reconsideration is thus DENIED.

SO ORDERED

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut this 3rd day of November, 2009.

/s/ Janet C. Hall
Janet C. Hall
United States District Judge