

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE

DAVID J. WIDI, JR.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	2:12-cv-188-JAW
)	
PAUL MCNEIL, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER ON MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On October 3, 2016, the Court issued an order rejecting David J. Widi, Jr.'s demand that he be allowed to conduct discovery against Paul McNeil, a dismissed Defendant.¹ *Order Den. Mot. to Compel Disc. and Strike* (ECF No. 368). On November 4, 2016, Mr. Widi moved this Court to reconsider its order on the motion to compel discovery. *Mot. for Recons.* (ECF No. 379). On November 8, 2016, Mr. McNeil responded to Mr. Widi's motion for reconsideration. *McNeil's Opp'n to Pl.'s Mot. for Recons. of Order Den. Mot. to Compel Disc.* (ECF No. 368) (ECF No. 380). On November 28, 2016, Mr. Widi filed his reply. *Reply to McNeil's Opp'n to Pl.'s Mot. for Recons. of Order Den. Mot. to Compel Disc.* (ECF No. 387).

The Court does not agree with Mr. Widi's recitation of the history of this case and his mischaracterization of the Court's rulings. What Mr. Widi has made clear is that he believes he is entitled to maintain his lawsuit against Defendant McNeil,

¹ Mr. Widi also sought to strike Defendant McNeil's response to his motion. *Mot. to Compel Disc. and Strike* (ECF No. 357). The Court rejected his request. *Order Den. Mot. to Compel Disc. and Strike* (ECF No. 368). Mr. Widi has not asked the Court to reconsider its ruling on this part of his motion. *Mot. for Recons.* (ECF No. 379).

despite the Court's repeated rulings to the contrary. The motion for reconsideration is yet another effort to convince the Court that it erred in dismissing Paul McNeil in the first place and that it has multiplied its error in failing to correct it, despite Mr. Widi's repeated insistence that it do so. However, Mr. Widi's motion makes no points that he has not raised before and that the Court has found unpersuasive. Thus, it is not a motion for reconsideration, it is a motion for reiteration and, as such, must fail.

The Court readily acknowledges that it is not infallible and that the Court of Appeals may view its rulings as Mr. Widi does. However, the Court has done its best and, as it has repeatedly written, there is little to be gained by pressing again and again the same arguments that the Court previously rejected. In sum, the Court is not persuaded that it has erred by refusing to allow Mr. Widi to engage in discovery against Paul McNeil, a dismissed Defendant.

The Court DENIES David J. Widi, Jr.'s Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 379).

SO ORDERED.

s/ John A. Woodcock, Jr.
JOHN A. WOODCOCK, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 27th day of July, 2017