

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

NEELU PAL,  
*Plaintiff,*

v.

ROBERT CIPOLLA, et al.,  
*Defendants.*

No. 3:18cv616(MPS)

**RULING ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Plaintiff Neelu Pal has filed a "motion to amend or alter judgment" under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). ECF No. 202. She seeks reconsideration of the Court's rulings granting partial summary judgment. ECF Nos. 193, 194. The motion is denied.

As an initial matter, Pal's motion is procedurally improper. Although Pal invokes Rule 59(e) as the authority for her request, Rule 59(e) contemplates only motions to alter or amend "judgments." The Court's rulings did not adjudicate all of Pal's claims against the defendants and judgment has not entered. Therefore Rule 59(e) does not govern. *See Annan v. City of New York Police Dep't*, 2015 WL 9581812, at \*1 (E.D.N.Y. Dec. 29, 2015) (finding Rule 59(e) did not apply to plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of partial summary judgment and instead construing motion under the Court's local rule governing reconsideration); *Raffe v. Am. Nat. Red Cross*, 2012 WL 140412, at \*1 (N.D.N.Y. Jan. 18, 2012) (finding that Rule 59(e) was inapplicable to a motion for reconsideration of the Court's partial summary judgment ruling because "Rule 59(e) only provides for review of final judgments, not, as here, an interlocutory order.") Pal's motion cannot be evaluated under the District of Connecticut's relevant local rule providing for reconsideration because her motion is untimely. *See D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 7(c)* (motions for reconsideration "shall be filed and served within seven (7) days of the decision or order from which such relief is sought"). The orders that Pal challenges were filed November

