**IN THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
PEORIA DIVISION**

WILLIAM WATTS,
      Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
      Respondent.

Case No. 1:16-CV-01382-JES

Order

Now before the Court is the *pro se* Petitioner, William Watts', Motion to Reconsider (D. 11).[1] For the reasons stated, *infra*, the Court DENIES the Petitioner's Motion.

The Petitioner filed an Objection to the Entry of Appearance in October 2016. (D. 5). Specifically, he objected to then-Assistant U.S. Attorney Bradley Murphy being replaced by Assistant U.S. Attorney Greg Walters in these proceedings. The Court denied the Petitioner's Objection, stating in relevant part: "[w]hile Mr. Watts may wish to choose opposing counsel for the Government, he has no right to do so, and the Court has no authority to choose for him either. With no authority to choose, the Court need not comment on Mr. Watts' preference for Mr. Murphy over Mr. Walters." *See* the Court's November 4, 2016 Text Order. Now, the Petitioner urges the Court to reconsider its ruling. (D. 11).

"Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." *Caisse Nationale de Credit v. CBI Industries*, 90 F.3d 1264, 1269 (7th Cir. 1996) (citations omitted). Manifest errors are those which involve the "wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent." *Oto v.*

---

[1] Citations to the Docket in this case are abbreviated as "D. __."

1

Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 224 F.3d 601, 606 (7th Cir. 2000). The Petitioner has failed to

highlight any manifest errors of law or fact in his Motion to Reconsider. Nor has he brought any

newly discovered evidence to the Court's attention. Therefore, the Court DENIES the

Petitioner's Motion.

   For the reasons stated, *supra*, the Petitioner's Motion to Reconsider (D. 11) is DENIED.

It is so ordered.

Entered on November 13, 2017

s/James E. Shadid
Chief United States District Judge