

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

MARC NORFLEET,

Plaintiff,

v.

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Defendant.

Case No. 10-cv-626-JPG

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on plaintiff Marc Norfleet's objection (Doc. 97) to Magistrate Judge Philip M. Frazier's January 26, 2015, scheduling and discovery order (Doc. 96) and motion to strike that order (Doc. 98). Norfleet argues the scheduling and discovery order is premature in light of his outstanding motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. 94) and motion for reconsideration (Doc. 95) of the Court's order denying Norfleet leave to file an amended pleading and possibly various other orders of the Court.

A district court reviewing a magistrate judge's decision on nondispositive issues should modify or set aside that decision if it is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A). The Court may also *sua sponte* reconsider any matter determined by a magistrate judge. L.R. 73.1(a); *Schur v. L.A. Weight Loss Ctrs., Inc.*, 577 F.3d 752, 760 (7th Cir. 2009).

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Frazier's scheduling and discovery order and finds it is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Further, the Court declines to reconsider the scheduling and discovery order or any other matters it has previously decided in this case, including but not limited to its decision not to allow Norfleet to file an amended pleading nearly two years beyond the deadline.

For these reasons, the Court:

- **AFFIRMS** Magistrate Judge Frazier's January 26, 2015, scheduling and discovery order (Doc.

96);

- **OVERRULES** Norfleet's objection (Doc. 97);
- **DENIES** Norfleet's motion to strike the scheduling and discovery order (Doc. 98); and
- **DENIES** Norfleet's motion for reconsideration (Doc. 95).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: February 5, 2015

s/J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
DISTRICT JUDGE