

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION**

**TARENT BRYANT,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**Mr. CARTER, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

---

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**Civil Action No.  
5:09-CV-281 (HL)**

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 21). Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider its order (Doc. 20) adopting the report and recommendation written by Magistrate Judge Hicks (Doc. 5).

Local Rule 7.6 warns that "Motions for Reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice." M.D. Ga., L.R. 7.6. A motion for reconsideration is appropriate if the moving party can show: "(1) there has been an intervening change in the law, (2) new evidence has been discovered that was not previously available to the parties at the time the original order was entered, or (3) reconsideration is necessary to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice." Pennamon v. United Bank, 2009 WL 2355816, at \*1 (M.D. Ga. July 28, 2009) (citing Wallance v. Georgia Dep't of Trans., 2006 WL 1582409, at \*2 (M.D. Ga. June 6, 2006). "[A] motion for reconsideration does not provide an opportunity to simply reargue the issue the Court has once determined." Id. (quoting Am. Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Hood, 278 F. Supp. 2d 1337, 1340 (M.D. Fla. 2003).

There is nothing in Plaintiff's motion showing that the law has changed, that new evidence has been discovered, that the Court made a clear error of law, or that the order was unjust. Moreover, Plaintiff appears to misunderstand that the Court did not find that all of Plaintiff's claims are frivolous. Plaintiff's claims for retaliation for filing grievances and mail censorship have gone forward.

His motion for reconsideration (Doc. 21) is accordingly denied.

**SO ORDERED**, this the 29<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2010.

**s/ Hugh Lawson**  
**HUGH LAWSON, SENIOR JUDGE**

lmc