

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION**

Albert Thomas,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	CIVIL ACTION NO.
	:	1:96-cv-00527-JOF
Georgia State Board of Pardons And	:	
Paroles, et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

OPINION & ORDER

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s motion for clarification [108] and Plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration [110].

On March 1, 1996, Plaintiff filed the instant suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against multiple Defendants, alleging various causes of action. After several motions were filed, the court narrowed Plaintiff’s complaint to his claim that Defendants had denied him annual parole reconsideration hearings under an unconstitutional retroactive application of amended regulations of the Georgia State Board of Pardons and Paroles (“the Board”). In 1999, the court found that the retroactive application in Plaintiff’s circumstances was unconstitutional and ordered yearly review of Plaintiff’s parole status. After a brief period where the Board failed to conduct yearly reconsideration, Plaintiff’s status has been considered on a regular

basis and the Board has continued to deny Plaintiff's request for parole. The court has issued a series of orders since that time rejecting Plaintiff's additional claims for relief. *See* Orders dated Feb. 4, 2003; Mar. 12, 2003; July 28, 2003; Jan. 14, 2004; Mar. 5, 2004; June 16, 2004; Nov. 2, 2004; Feb. 1, 2005; June 12, 2009; Dec. 1, 2009; March 30, 2010; and May 4, 2010. The gravamen of those orders has been that the court has resolved Plaintiff's 1996 complaint and any new issues he may have – such as inadequate medical care or alleged unconstitutional composition of the parole board – requires that he file a new complaint.

In the latest motions, it appears to the court that Plaintiff has filed a new complaint, styled *Thomas v. Perdue*, Civil Action No. 1:10-CV-203-CAM, relating to conditions in his prison. Plaintiff appears to challenge some of the rulings made by the court in that case. Of course, this court cannot review the rulings made in that case. Further, to the extent that Plaintiff continues to challenge the constitutional make-up of the Georgia Board of Pardons and Paroles, the court also rejects his motions for clarification and reconsideration.

For the foregoing reasons, the court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for clarification [108] and DENIES Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration [110].

IT IS SO ORDERED this 14th day of June 2010.

/s/ J. Owen Forrester

J. OWEN FORRESTER
SENIOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE