

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
WESTERN DIVISION**

SEAN YOUSAF,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	No. 4:18-cv-00321-DGK
	)	
THE CURATORS OF THE UNIVERSITY	)	
OF MISSOURI, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO RECONSIDER**

This lawsuit arises from Plaintiff Sean Yousaf’s dismissal from the University of Missouri at Kansas City School of Dentistry (“the SOD”). Plaintiff alleges the SOD and various faculty members and school officials violated the SOD’s academic policies, his federal and state due process rights, and Title VI, as well as committed various state law torts against him.

Yesterday, the Court denied Plaintiff’s motion to strike various affidavits submitted by Defendants (Doc. 47). Now before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider (Doc. 48) the Court’s order denying the motion to strike.

Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider rehashes several arguments the Court previously rejected, which is not permitted. *Broadway v. Norris*, 193 F.3d 987, 990 (8th Cir. 1999) (holding a motion for reconsideration “is not a vehicle for simple reargument on the merits.”)

Plaintiff also argues the Court should reconsider because it erred by not considering a reply brief he filed in support of the motion to strike. Plaintiff contends this reply brief addresses several of the Court’s reasons for denying the motion, arguments the Court apparently overlooked.

The Court did not overlook any arguments contained in a reply brief, however, because no such reply brief was ever filed.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff should not be too discouraged though, because the failure to file the reply brief had no effect on the outcome. The Court has considered these arguments as summarized in Plaintiff's motion to reconsider, and they would not have altered the Court's decision.

The motion to reconsider (Doc. 48) is DENIED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: November 7, 2018

/s/ Greg Kays  
GREG KAYS, CHIEF JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

---

<sup>1</sup> It is clear from the docket that no such reply brief was ever filed: Plaintiff's motion to strike is docket number 42; docket number 43 is Defendants' reply suggestions on their motion to dismiss; docket number 44 is Defendants' suggestions in opposition to the motion to strike; docket number 45 is a motion for a teleconference; docket number 46 is an order denying the motion for a teleconference; and docket number 47 is the Court's order denying Plaintiff's motion to strike.