Jones v. Google LLC, Inc. Doc. 63

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

JOSEPH LEE JONES,

Plaintiff,

vs. Case No. 20-3072-SAC

GOOGLE LLC, INC.,

Defendant.

O R D E R

This case was dismissed on April 14, 2020. Since that time plaintiff has filed motions to alter or amend or filed pleadings which were treated as a motion to alter or amend the judgment. See Doc. Nos. 48, 49, 52, 57. The court has denied these efforts. The court has also: rejected an effort to amend the complaint that was filed after this case was closed (Doc. No. 47); denied a motion for sanctions (Doc. No. 58); denied a motion for default judgment (Doc. No. 42); and denied a motion for temporary restraining order (Doc. No. 42).

This case is now before the court upon four pleadings from plaintiff. These are: a motion to reopen the case (Doc. No. 59); a supplement in support of a temporary restraining order (Doc. No. 60); and what appear to be identical pleadings intended as a supplement to or a renewed motion to reopen the case or for sanctions and default judgment (Doc. Nos. 61 and 62).

Dockets.Justia.com

The relief requested in these pleadings motions shall be denied. It is well-established that a party may not ask for reconsideration by rehashing arguments previously considered or presenting new facts or theories which could have been raised earlier. Servants of Paraclete v. Does, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2000); Howard v. Farmers Ins. Co., Inc., 2020 WL 1935026 *2 (D.Kan. 4/22/2020); Achey v. Linn County Bank, 174 F.R.D. 489, 490 (D.Kan. 1997); Voelkel v. Gen. Motors Corp., 846 F.Supp. 1482, 1483 (D.Kan. 1994). These pleadings seek reopening or reconsideration of the dismissal of this case, or reconsideration of the denial of motions. Plaintiff, however, repeats past arguments or presents new material which could have been presented previously. Plaintiff fails to show good cause for reconsideration or for entering a judgment for damages or sanctions in a case which has been dismissed in favor of defendant.

In conclusion, plaintiff shall be denied the relief requested in Doc. Nos. 59, 60, 61 and 62.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 1st day of May 2020, at Topeka, Kansas.

s/Sam A. Crow
U.S. District Senior Judge