IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI **GREENVILLE DIVISION**

CARL DENNIS YOUNG

PLAINTIFF

Doc. 30

V.

NO. 4:14-CV-109-DMB-JMV

JAMES SIMONIAN, ET AL.

DEFENDANTS

ORDER DENYING MOTION

Before the Court is Plaintiff's motion [28] for reconsideration of the Court's October 23,

2014, memorandum opinion and final judgment dismissing the instant case for failure to state a

claim upon which relief could be granted. The Court interprets the motion, using the liberal

standard for pro se litigants set forth in Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), as a motion to

amend judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). An order granting relief under Rule 59(e) is

appropriate: (1) when there has been an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) where the

movant presents newly discovered evidence that was previously unavailable; or (3) to correct a

manifest error of law or fact. Schiller v. Physicians Res. Grp. Inc., 342 F.3d 563, 567 (5th Cir.

2003). The instant motion is simply a restatement of the claims the Court has already rejected.

Thus, Plaintiff has neither asserted nor proven any of the justifications to amend a judgment under

Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). As such, Plaintiff's motion [28] for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED, this 30th day of March, 2015.

/s/ Debra M. Brown______UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE