Raimondo v. Hood et al Doc. 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

JOSEPH RAIMONDO,	
Plaintiff,	
VS.	Case No. 10-CV-15107 HON. GEORGE CARAM STEEH
DENISE PAGE HOOD, et al.,	
Defendants.	

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION [#5]

On December 23, 2010, the court entered an order dismissing plaintiff's complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1). Plaintiff now moves for reconsideration of this court's December 23, 2010 order.

Local Rule 7.1(h)(3) of the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan provides:

[M]otions for rehearing or reconsideration which merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication, shall not be granted. The movant shall not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that a different disposition of the case must result from a correction thereof.

E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(h)(3). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate a palpable defect by which this court has been misled, the correction of which will result in a different disposition of this case.

This court lacks jurisdiction to entertain plaintiff's complaint because the allegations

are totally implausible, attenuated, unsubstantiated, frivolous and devoid of any merit.

Apple v. Glenn, 183 F. 3d 477, 479 (6th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 4, 2011

S/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on April 4, 2011, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also to Joseph Raimondo at P.O. Box 330, Armada, MI 48005.

S/Josephine Chaffee Deputy Clerk