

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

GRAZYNA SKŁOWDOWSKA-GREZAK,

15-cv-1670

Plaintiff,

- against -

JUDITH A. STEIN, PH.D, ET AL.,

MEMORANDUM OPINION
AND ORDER

Defendants.

JOHN G. KOELTL, District Judge:

The Court has received several motions filed by the plaintiff, including motions for reconsideration of the Court's Order denying the plaintiff's motion to reopen the case, ECF No. 103; to strike the defendants' motions to dismiss, ECF Nos. 37 and 67; and for a stay of the Court's Order dismissing the case, ECF No. 98. See ECF Nos. 105-107 (plaintiff's motions).

"The standard for granting [a motion for reconsideration] is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked." Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). The plaintiff has failed to make such a showing, and has not pointed to any information that "might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court." Id. The motion for reconsideration, ECF No. 105, is therefore **denied**.

The plaintiff has also filed a motion to strike the defendants' motions to dismiss. Those motions have already been decided, and the plaintiff's motion is therefore **denied as moot**. To the extent that the motion is intended as one for reconsideration of the Court's order granting those motions and dismissing the case, ECF No. 98, for the reasons explained above, that application is also denied.

Finally, the plaintiff seeks a stay pending the disposition of a petition for a writ of mandamus in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. ECF No. 106. That application is denied. The plaintiff has failed to show a likelihood of success on any petition for a writ of mandamus. Moreover, the plaintiff has failed to show any likelihood of irreparable injury if the stay is not granted. See McNamee v. Clemens, 2014 WL 1682025, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. April 28, 2014) (setting out the factors to be considered by the Court in analyzing a motion for a stay pending the outcome of an application for a writ of mandamus) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 62). The petitioner's case has been dismissed and she is free to file any available appeal in the Court of Appeals and to seek expedited review in that Court. The plaintiff has failed to show what irreparable injury would result from the dismissal of her case in this court, which dismissal was thoroughly justified. The application for a stay, ECF No. 106, is therefore **denied**.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York

April 5, 2017

_____/s/_____

John G. Koeltl

United States District Judge