Redd v. Vails et al Doc. 84

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

PARRISH R	EDD,		
	Plaintiff,		No. 14-14340
v.			District Judge Marianne O. Battani Magistrate Judge R. Steven Whalen
TERRANCE VAILS, ET AL.,			
	Defendants.	/	

## ORDER DENYING RECONSIDERATION [Doc. #78]

Plaintiff Parrish Redd is litigating this case *pro se*. On May 19, 2016, I entered an order denying his motion to appoint counsel [Doc. #77]. Before the Court at this time is his motion for reconsideration of that order [Doc. #78].

Motions for reconsideration are subject to E.D. Mich. L.R. 7.1(g)(3), which provides:

"(3) *Grounds*. Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for rehearing or reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case."

Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration presents nothing new to show a "palpable defect" in the proceedings, or that a different result should ensue. Instead, the motion

merely presents the same arguments that I have already considered and rejected.

Because Plaintiff has not met the demanding requirements of Rule 7.1(g)(3), the motion for reconsideration [Doc. #78] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

s/R. Steven Whalen
R. STEVEN WHALEN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Date: September 27, 2016

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was sent to parties of record on September 27, 2016, electronically and/or by U.S. mail.

s/Carolyn M. Ciesla

Case Manager to the Honorable R. Steven Whalen