

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X
JORGE RODRIGUEZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,

Defendant.
----- X

----- X
JORGE RODRIGUEZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

L&M BUS CORP.,

Defendant.
----- X

----- X
JORGE RODRIGUEZ,

Plaintiff,

-against-

NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF
MOTOR VEHICLES,

Defendant.
----- X

FILED
IN CLERK'S OFFICE
US DISTRICT COURT E.D.N.Y.
★ NOV 06 2017 ★
BROOKLYN OFFICE

David
11/16/17
(8)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

16-cv-6655 (ENV) (LB)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

16-cv-7150 (ENV) (LB)

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MEMORANDUM & ORDER

17-cv-1851 (ENV) (LB)

Cam

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- : MEMORANDUM & ORDER
 :
 NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF :
 LABOR, :
 :
 Defendant. :
 ----- X
 ----- X

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- : MEMORANDUM & ORDER
 :
 KINGS COUNTY CLERK'S OFFICE, :
 :
 Defendant. :
 ----- X
 ----- X

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- : MEMORANDUM & ORDER
 :
 GAMESTOP, :
 :
 Defendant. :
 ----- X
 ----- X

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- : MEMORANDUM & ORDER
 :
 DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY :
 ADMINISTRATION, :
 :
 Defendant. :
 ----- X

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- :
 :
 NEW YORK CITY NYPD, DEPARTMENT OF :
 CRIMINAL JUSTICE SERVICES, DOMESTIC :
 VIOLENCE CENTER, and NEW YORK POLICE :
 DEPARTMENT 84th PRECINCT, :
 :
 Defendants. :
 ----- X

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- :
 :
 CHASE BANK, :
 :
 Defendant. :
 ----- X

----- X
 JORGE RODRIGUEZ, :
 : NOT FOR PUBLICATION
 :
 Plaintiff, :
 :
 -against- :
 :
 SPRINT, :
 :
 Defendant. :
 ----- X

VITALIANO, D.J.

Pro se plaintiff Jorge Rodriguez’s motion, filed October 30, 2017, which seeks reconsideration of the Court’s October 19, 2017, order dismissing each of the above-captioned consolidated actions, is denied because he again makes no showing of the Court’s misapprehension of facts or law, at the time of its rulings, which would require the Court to

revisit its prior decisions.¹ *See Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). For the same reasons, plaintiff’s “letter of explanation,” filed October 31, 2017, which the Court construes as a second motion for reconsideration of the Court’s October 19, 2017 order, is denied. *Id.*

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeals would not be taken in good faith, and, therefore, *in forma pauperis* status is denied for the purpose of any appeals. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45, 82 S. Ct. 917, 920-21, 8 L. Ed. 2d 21 (1962).

The Clerk of Court is directed to maintain these consolidated cases on the closed docket.²

So Ordered.

Dated: Brooklyn, New York

November 3, 2017

/s/ USDJ ERIC N. VITALIANO

ERIC N. VITALIANO

United States District Judge

¹ Rodriguez has also appealed the Court’s October 26, 2017, order denying a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s September 11, 2017, orders dismissing his various cases. The Court can nevertheless consider the motions at issue in this case. The Second Circuit has explicitly noted that while “the docketing of a notice of appeal ousts the district court of jurisdiction except insofar as it is reserved to it explicitly by statute or rule[,] District Courts may “entertain and deny the Rule 60(b) motion.” *Toliver v. Cty. of Sullivan*, 957 F.2d 47, 49 (2d Cir. 1992) (per curiam).

² The Court also acknowledges Plaintiff’s letter withdrawing his motion for reconsideration as to 17-cv-2041, 17-cv-2042, 17-cv-2043, and 17-cv-2044.