

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
SOUTH BEND DIVISION

JEROME WILLIAMS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	CAUSE NO. 3:15-CV-428 WL
)	
RON NEAL and HOWARD MORTON,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

OPINION AND ORDER

Jerome Williams, a pro se prisoner, filed a motion (ECF 38) objecting to this court’s order (ECF 36) dividing his unrelated claims into three separate lawsuits. To the extent he is arguing the court lacks the authority divide his claims, that is incorrect. The Seventh Circuit has clearly stated that when faced with a pro se prisoner’s complaint containing unrelated claims, “[a] district judge [can] solve the problem by severance (creating multiple suits that can be separately screened) . . .” *Wheeler v. Wexford Health Sources, Inc.*, 689 F.3d 680, 683 (7th Cir. 2012). To the extent he is arguing the court should have allowed him to decide how to divide his claims, the court tried four times (ECF 6, 9, 15, and 27) to get him to file a complaint containing related claims. To the extent he is arguing his claims should not have been divided because they are related, he has provided no explanation for how they are related beyond asking the court to reconsider his prior submissions. However, “[r]econsideration is not an appropriate forum for rehashing previously rejected arguments . . .” *Caisse Nationale de Credit Agricole v. CBI Indus., Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1264, 1270 (7th Cir.1996). Therefore, Mr. Williams has provided no basis for reconsidering the order separating his claims.

When the unrelated claims were divided into separate cases, what remained in this one was Mr. Williams allegations that Superintendent Ron Neal and Executive Assistant Howard Morton retaliated against him by denying the restoration of good time credits because he filed a lawsuit. In a prior order (ECF 37) the court screened these claims and explained why the facts alleged did not state a claim. Pursuant to *Luevano v. Wal-Mart*, 722 F.3d 1014 (7th Cir. 2013), Mr. Williams was granted leave to file an amended complaint. In response, he filed (ECF 39) an exact copy of his prior complaint (ECF 35) with a new signature date. Since the complaint has not changed, neither has the analysis of it. Therefore, for the reasons previously explained (ECF 37), the claims remaining in this case against Ron Neal and Howard Morton do not state a claim and this case will be dismissed.

For these reasons, the motion to reconsider (ECF 38) is **DENIED** and this case is **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A for failure to state a claim against the only remaining defendants Ron Neal and Howard Morton.

SO ORDERED.

ENTERED: April 17, 2017

s/William C. Lee

William C. Lee, Judge
United States District Court