

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

_____	:	
MICHAEL BRISCOE,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	3:09-cv-1642 (CSH)
v.	:	
	:	<b>March 12, 2014</b>
	:	
CITY OF NEW HAVEN,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
_____	:	

**RULING ON PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION  
OF COURT'S RULING [DOC. 309] ON PENDING MOTIONS**

**HAIGHT, Senior District Judge:**

Plaintiff has filed a limited motion [Doc. 310] for reconsideration of one point contained in the Court's Ruling [Doc. 309] on certain pending motions in this Title VII case.

Specifically, Plaintiff focuses upon the last sentence in that Ruling and accompanying Order (page 7), which reads as follows: "5. No reference is made in this Order to the oral exam [Doc. 106] because that was not involved in any of the prior motions." Plaintiff's present motion requests at 1 "that the Court's Ruling be modified to reflect that it applies to both portions of the test, Dkt ## 105 and 106."

Plaintiff's present motion identifies an inaccuracy in the quoted sentence from the Court's Order. It is incorrect to say that the oral exam "was not involved in any of the prior motions." While

Plaintiff's motion to modify the protective order [Doc. 292] referred only to the written portion, the Intervenor's subsequent motion [Doc. 299] and Plaintiff's motion to seal [Doc. 302] referred to the entire test, that is to say, both the written and oral parts.

This complication is not substantive in any way. The sensible modification is simply to delete Paragraph 5 from the Order with which the Court's Ruling and Order [Doc. 309] concludes.

In these circumstances, Plaintiff's present motion for reconsideration is GRANTED. The Court's Ruling and Order [Doc. 309] is MODIFIED by DELETING Paragraph 5 from page 7.

It is SO ORDERED.

Dated: New Haven, Connecticut  
March 12, 2014

/s/ Charles S. Haight, Jr.  
CHARLES S. HAIGHT, JR.  
Senior United States District Judge