

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| CHARLES RYAN GLOVER, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | Case No. 4:15CV00022 AGF |
| |) | |
| MISSOURI CHILD SUPPORT |) | |
| ENFORCEMENT AGENCY, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER


This matter is before the Court on pro se Plaintiff Charles Glover’s “Motion to Appeal all Orders.” In this motion, Plaintiff expresses his dissatisfaction with the Court’s Orders of July 28, 2015, and August 5, 2015, dismissing, respectively, the claims against Judge Kimberly Dahlen based on judicial immunity, and David Brown based on prosecutorial immunity. Construing Plaintiff’s motion as one to certify the Court’s Orders for interlocutory appeal, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), the motion shall be denied, as the requirements for such an appeal have not been met. *See, e.g., Lutzeier v. Citigroup Inc.*, No. 4:14-CV-00183-RLW, 2015 WL 1821255, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Apr. 21, 2015).

To the extent that Plaintiff’s motion is one for this Court’s reconsideration of the above-noted Orders, Plaintiff has not made a showing entitling him to such relief. “Motions for reconsideration serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” *Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp.*, 839

F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (citation omitted). “A motion for reconsideration is not a vehicle for simple reargument on the merits.” *R.G. Brinkmann Co. v. Amerisure Ins. Co.*, No. 4:11CV1125 JAR, 2013 WL 328662, at *1 (E.D. Mo. Jan. 29, 2013) (citation omitted). Plaintiff’s motion sets forth no manifest error of law or fact, nor does it present any newly discovered evidence. Rather, the motion reiterates Plaintiff’s arguments raised in his previous filings, and Plaintiff’s theories on the societal ramifications of the Court’s Orders.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff Charles Glover’s “Motion to Appeal all Orders” is **DENIED**. (Doc. No. 39.)



AUDREY G. FLEISSIG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 25th day of August, 2015.