

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA

DODIYI J. WILLIAMWEST

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NO: 14-2330

BARACK OBAMA, ET AL.

SECTION: R(5)

**ORDER AND REASONS**

Before the Court is plaintiff Dodiya Williamwest's motion for reconsideration<sup>1</sup> and motion for clarification<sup>2</sup> of this Court's Order adopting the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendations and judgment dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims.<sup>3</sup>

A district court has considerable discretion to grant or to deny a motion for reconsideration. See *Edward H. Bohlin Co. v. Banning Co.*, 6 F.3d 350, 355 (5th Cir. 1993). A court's reconsideration of an earlier order is an extraordinary remedy, which should be granted sparingly. See *Fields v. Pool Offshore, Inc.*, No. Civ. A. 97-3170, 1998 WL 43217, at \*2 (E.D. La. Feb. 3, 1988), *aff'd*, 182 F.3d 353 (5th Cir. 1999); *Bardwell v. George G. Sharp, Inc.*, Nos. Civ. A. 93-3590, 93-3591, 1995 WL 517120, at \*1 (E.D. La. Aug. 30, 1995). The Court must "strike the proper balance" between the need for finality and "the need to render just decisions on the basis of all the facts." *Banning*, 6 F.3d at 355. To succeed on a motion for reconsideration, a party must "clearly

---

<sup>1</sup> R. Doc. 16.

<sup>2</sup> R. Doc. 17.

<sup>3</sup> R. Docs. 14 & 15.

establish either a manifest error of law or fact or must present newly discovered evidence." *Ross v. Marshall*, 426 F.3d 745, 763 (5th Cir. 2005) (quoting *Pioneer Natural Res. USA, Inc. v. Paper, Allied Indus., Chem. & Energy Workers Int'l Union Local 4-487*, 328 F.3d 818, 820 (5th Cir. 2003)).

The Court finds that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration has not established either a manifest error of law or fact or presented newly discovered evidence in support of reconsidering this Court's prior Order and Judgment. Indeed, plaintiff's motion for reconsideration consists of the same arguments raised previously before the Magistrate Judge and this Court. Similarly, plaintiff's motion for clarification points to nothing in the Court's previous order requiring further explanation. Accordingly, plaintiff's motions for reconsideration and clarification are DENIED.

New Orleans, Louisiana, this 30th day of June, 2015.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Sarah S. Vance", is written over a horizontal line.

SARAH S. VANCE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE