

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

| | | |
|------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| DANIEL BARFIELD, | : | |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff, | : | |
| | : | |
| v. | : | Case No. 5:14-CV-4 (CAR) |
| | : | |
| Nurse MARY GORE, | : | |
| | : | Proceedings under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 |
| Defendant. | : | |
| _____ | : | |

ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

Before the Court are Plaintiff Daniel Barfield’s Motions for Reconsideration filed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).¹ In his Motions, Plaintiff requests the Court reconsider two of the Magistrate Judge’s Orders [Docs. 114 & 118]. In the first Order, the Magistrate Judge denied Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time to file a Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Leave to File Excess Pages. Then in the second Order, the Magistrate Judge dismissed Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration, as his request to file the untimely motion was previously denied. Having considered the Motion and the applicable law, Plaintiff’s Motions for Reconsideration [Docs. 122 & 123] are **DENIED**.

¹ Plaintiff “objects” to the Magistrate Judge’s Orders, which the Court will construe as Motions for Reconsideration.

Local Rule 7.6 provides that “[m]otions for reconsideration shall not be filed as a matter of routine practice.”² Indeed, “it is well-settled that motions for reconsideration are disfavored and that relief under Rule 59(e) is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly.”³ Motions for reconsideration should be granted only if: (1) there has been an intervening change in controlling law; (2) new evidence has been discovered; or (3) reconsideration is needed to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.⁴ Importantly, “[a] motion for reconsideration does not provide an opportunity to simply reargue the issue the Court has once determined.”⁵

Here, Plaintiff’s Motion fails to meet any of the standards discussed above. Rather, Plaintiff merely reasserts the same arguments fully considered by the Magistrate Judge in his previous ruling. Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motions for Reconsideration [Docs. 122 & 123] of the Magistrate Judge’s Orders.

SO ORDERED, this 29th day of September, 2016.

S/ C. Ashley Royal
C. ASHLEY ROYAL, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

² L.R. 7.6.

³ *Krstic v. Princess Cruise Lines, Ltd. (Corp.)*, 706 F. Supp. 2d 1271, 1282 (S.D. Fla. 2010).

⁴ *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Hamilton*, 385 F. Supp. 2d 1330, 1337 (N.D. Ga. 2005).

⁵ *Pennamon v. United Bank*, No. 5:09-CV-169 (CAR), 2009 WL 2355816, at *1 (M.D. Ga. July 28, 2009) (quotation omitted).