

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

| | | |
|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| _____ |) | |
| ARIEL AYANNA, |) | |
| Plaintiff |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | CIVIL ACTION |
| |) | NO. 10-CV-12155-NMG |
| DECHERT, LLP, |) | |
| Defendant, |) | |
| _____ |) | |

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

February 6, 2012

SOROKIN, M.J.

At the Rule 16 conference, the Court established a schedule for discovery. Approximately half of the allotted discovery period elapsed before the Plaintiff served his written discovery requests. The requests the Plaintiff sought to compel were substantially over broad and unduly burdensome. Docket #52 at 2 & n.1. The Plaintiff pressed this position in his written presentation and oral argument. After a lengthy hearing, in a written order, the Court analyzed each of the requests separately and made individual rulings on each request, allowing some and denying others. Docket #52. The Court did not extend the then expired period for fact discovery, but ordered the Defendant to produce the information by a specified date. Id. The Plaintiff, after a procedural misstep, see Electronic Order dated Jan. 13, 2010, moved for reconsideration. The Motion identifies neither an error in law nor fact infecting the Court’s decision, but rather, in essence, contends that in light of what the Court did order the Defendant to produce, the Plaintiff is entitled to or needs

more discovery as to certain categories of documents. See Docket #55. After careful consideration of the Plaintiff's Motion and the opposition filed by the Defendant and in light of the standards applicable to motions to reconsideration as well as the stage of this litigation, the Motion for Reconsideration is DENIED.

/S/ Leo T. Sorokin _____

LEO T. SOROKIN

MAGISTRATE JUDGE