Moore v. Hardy Doc. 24

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

EDWARD A. MOORE, JR.,	)	
Petitioner,	)	
,	)	
V.	)	
	)	No. 12 C 8325
MARCUS HARDY,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

## MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

JAMES F. HOLDERMAN, Chief Judge:

For the reasons explained below, the motion of petitioner Edward A. Moore, Jr. [22] for reconsideration of his motion for appointment of counsel is denied. Petitioner Moore shall file his reply by 4/22/13. Moore's filing of 2/12/13 [18] is terminated as moot, but the court will consider its contents as part of Moore's reply to the state's response to his petition.

## Statement

The court denied petitioner Edward Moore's motion for appointment of counsel in part on the ground that many of his claims are likely defaulted and that the appointment of counsel would not do him any good. (Dkt. No. 17) Moore now moves for reconsideration of the court's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel on the ground that his filing of February 12, 2013 shows that his claims are not defaulted. The court has reviewed Moore's filing of February 12, and has determined that his contentions that his claims are not defaulted are without merit. The court will consider Moore's February 12 filing as part of his reply, which is due April 22, 2013.

**ENTER:** 

AMES F. HOLDERMAN

Chief Judge, United States District Court

Date: March 12, 2013