

general, granting a motion for reconsideration is only justified if there is “an intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” See Virgin Atl. Airways, Ltd. v. Nat’l. Mediation Bd., 956 F.2d 1245, 1255 (2d Cir. 1992) (quoting 18 C. Wright, A. Miller & E. Cooper, Federal Practice & Procedure § 4478 at 790).

The plaintiff has not pointed to any controlling law or to any facts that the court overlooked in the March 2014 Ruling. He has not established that the Ruling constituted clear error, and he has not shown that granting the present Motion is necessary to prevent manifest injustice. Instead, the plaintiff’s Motion relitigates issues already addressed by this court.

Likewise, the court has already considered the issuance of a certificate of appealability and declined to do so. Nothing that the petitioner has brought forth in his Motion for Reconsideration serves as a basis to issue the certificate.

For the foregoing reasons, the plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut this 1st day of July, 2014.

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