

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

EZEKIEL ADAIR,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 14-1174-EFM-KGG
)	
WICHITA PUBLIC SCHOOLS)	
(USD 259), <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

**MEMORANDUM & ORDER ON
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

Now before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion asking the Court to “reconsider its denial of new found information and in camera review.” (Doc. 47, at 3.) The Court’s prior Order (Doc. 43) granted Plaintiff’s underlying Motion to Compel (Doc. 41) in part and ordered Defendants to produce certain documents for an *in camera* inspection by the Court. Upon receipt and a subsequent review of the documents, the Court entered a Minute Order, finding

that the documents are confidential in nature, and do not relate to the Plaintiff or his claims in this case. The documents are not relevant and will not lead to relevant evidence. The Defendant is not ordered to produce the documents to the Plaintiff.

(Doc. 45, March 17, 2015, Minute Order, text entry.)

Plaintiff moves for reconsideration of these prior Orders, apparently basing the request on recently “produced documents and the availability of new evidence . . .” (Doc. 47, at 3.) The Court, however, does not find any basis for reconsideration in Plaintiff’s current motion. As stated above, the Court has already granted Plaintiff’s request for an *in camera* review of the documents Defendants have submitted to the Court, and the Court has reviewed, the documents at issue. The Court found the documents to be irrelevant to these proceedings.

Regardless of what Plaintiff may contend it has gleaned from other recently produced documents or newly presented evidence, the information in the underlying documents has no bearing on Plaintiff’s claims or Defendants’ defenses. Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider (Doc. 47) is, therefore **DENIED**.¹

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 47) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated at Wichita, Kansas, on this 25th day of March, 2015.

S/ KENNETH G. GALE
KENNETH G. GALE
United States Magistrate Judge

¹ While Defendants have yet to respond to Plaintiff’s motion – and the time to do so has not expired – the Court finds a response to be unnecessary.