

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DIVISION OF KENTUCKY  
CENTRAL DIVISION at LEXINGTON

CARL BUGGS, JR.,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Civil Case No.
v.	)	5:12-cv-337-JMH
	)	
FRANCISCO J. QUINTANA,	)	<b>MEMORANDUM OPINION &amp; ORDER</b>
Warden,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

\*\*\*

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration Pursuant to Rule 59(e) [D.E. 6], in which he asks this Court to reconsider its earlier memorandum opinion and order and judgment denying his petition for relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 [De 4 & 5].

"A motion under Rule 59(e) is not an opportunity to re-argue a case." *Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians v. Engler*, 146 F.3d 367, 374 (6th Cir. 1998) (citing *FDIC v. World Univ. Inc.*, 978 F.2d 10, 16 (1st Cir. 1992)). Instead, a Rule 59(e) motion may only be granted if "there is a clear error of law, newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law, or to prevent manifest injustice." *GenCorp, Inc. v. American*

*Intern. Underwriters*, 178 F.3d 804, 834 (6th Cir. 1999).

The Court has reviewed Petitioner's motion and concludes that it does not satisfy this standard on any of the permissible grounds.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration Pursuant to Rule 59(e) [D.E. 6] shall be, and the same hereby is, **DENIED**.

This the 14th day of January, 2013.



**Signed By:**

Joseph M. Hood *JMH*

**Senior U.S. District Judge**