

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
| JEFFREY GREENWELL, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. 4:13-CV-2566 CAS |
| |) | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Petitioner Jeffrey Greenwell’s Motion Requesting Reconsideration. (Doc. 10). Petitioner asks the Court to reconsider its denial of his motion for issuance of a subpoena, motion to compel, and motion for leave to amend his § 2255 motion. The government has not responded to this motion, and the time for doing so has passed. Petitioner’s Motion will be denied.

Motions to reconsider provide “for extraordinary relief which may be granted only upon an adequate showing of exceptional circumstances.” Jones v. Swanson, 512 F.3d 1045, 1048 (8th Cir. 2008). “Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” Arnold v. ADT Sec. Servs., Inc., 627 F.3d 716, 721 (8th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted).

Petitioner’s statements in support of the instant motion amount to nothing more than restatements of the arguments from his original motions. Petitioner has failed to show exceptional circumstances, manifest errors of law or fact, or the existence of newly discovered evidence. Because Petitioner’s arguments are not a proper basis for a motion for reconsideration, his motion will be denied.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's Motion Requesting Reconsideration is
DENIED. [Doc. 10]



CHARLES A. SHAW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 2nd day of August, 2016.