

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

SEAN D. WOODSON, #05664-015	*	
	*	Civil Action No. JKB-14-1189
Petitioner	*	
	*	
v.	*	
	*	
STATE’S ATTORNEY FOR THE STATE	*	
OF MARYLAND	*	
	*	
Respondent	*	
	***	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

In correspondence received on May 19, 2014, Sean D. Woodson expressed disagreement with the court’s May 6, 2014, dismissal of his petition for writ of habeas corpus. (ECF No. 5.) Mindful that Woodson is a self-represented litigant, the court will treat his correspondence as a motion for reconsideration.

A motion to reconsider under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 (e) is granted only “(1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available at trial; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice.” *Zinkand v. Brown*, 478 F.3d 634, 637 (4th Cir. 2007) (citations omitted). “In general, reconsideration of a judgment after its entry is an extraordinary remedy which should be used sparingly.” *Id.* A Rule 59(e) motion “may not be used to relitigate old matters, or to raise arguments or present evidence that could have been raised prior to entry of judgment.” *Id.* (quoting 11 *Wright, et al., Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2810.1, at 127–28 (2d ed. 1995)).

Woodson’s petition asserts that respondent violated his rights under the Interstate Agreement on Detainers (“IAD”) by failing to execute his detainers and resolve pending violation of probation charges against him. This court dismissed the petition because the IAD

