

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

GHULAM NASIM

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

NO: 14-2647

COMMANDER GOODLY, ET AL.

SECTION: "A" (1)

**ORDER AND REASONS**

Before the Court is a **Motion to Vacate Orders (Rec. Doc. 29)** filed by Plaintiff Ghulam Nasim, who appears pro se. Plaintiff moves the Court to vacate an order from this Court granting a motion to dismiss and denying a motion to stay, and he moves the Court to vacate an order denying a motion to vacate judgment. For the following reasons, the motion is **DENIED**.

As summarized in the Court's previous order (Rec. Doc. 28), Plaintiff Ghulam Nasim claimed that on November 22, 2013, four unknown men assaulted him as he was waiting for a taxi cab at the 1400 block of North Broad Avenue. Plaintiff alleged that the four men struck him repeatedly and demanded money. Plaintiff alleged that Defendants had not contacted him regarding the incident that occurred, despite a request filed with Commander Goodly's office as to the status of capturing the assailants. (Rec. Doc. 1, Compl. at 3). Plaintiff broadly alleged that Defendants conspired to cover-up and derail Plaintiff's case, which violated "fundamental rules of justice." (Rec. Doc. 1, Compl. at 4).

On June 10, 2015, Defendants sent Plaintiff a letter with the requested update. (Rec. Doc. 24). Subsequently, on June 12, 2015, this Court granted judgment in favor of Defendants, dismissing Plaintiff's complaint for failure to state a claim.

In Plaintiff's first motion to vacate, Plaintiff pointed to no newly discovered evidence or change in the controlling law. Nor did Plaintiff identify a manifest legal or factual error upon which the judgment was based, or otherwise explain why the motion "is necessary in order to


prevent manifest injustice.” FRCP 59(e). In the instant motion, Plaintiff has submitted the same evidence and asserted that the Court did not read it. The Court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff’s evidence again, and it has carefully reviewed its previous judgments. The Court finds that Plaintiff’s evidence does not give the Court proper grounds on which to vacate the judgments.

As the Court has stated previously, the Court sympathizes with Plaintiff’s suffering, and the Court understands that Plaintiff disagrees with this Court’s rulings. Nonetheless, there was not enough evidence here to support a claim by Plaintiff against Defendants, and there is still not enough evidence.

Accordingly, and for the foregoing reasons;

**IT IS ORDERED** that the **Motion to Vacate Judgment (Rec. Doc. 29)** filed by Plaintiff Ghulam Nasim is **DENIED**.

October 2, 2015



---

JAY C. ZAINY  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE