

F.3d 122, 126 (2d Cir. 2016) (quoting *United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948)). A ruling is contrary to law if it “fails to apply or misapplies relevant statutes, case law or rules of procedure.” *Winfield v. City of New York*, No. 15 Civ. 5236, 2017 WL 5054727, at *2 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 2, 2017) (internal citation omitted). “It is well-settled that a magistrate judge’s resolution of a nondispositive matter should be afforded substantial deference and may be overturned only if found to have been an abuse of discretion.” *Xie v. JPMorgan Chase Short-Term Disability Plan*, 15 Civ. 4546, 2018 WL 501605, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 19, 2018) (internal citation omitted).


WHEREAS, decisions resolving requests to compel responses related to discovery are not dispositive. *See Pegoraro v. Marrero*, 281 F.R.D. 122, 125 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (holding that a Magistrate Judge’s resolution of a “request to compel production” is evaluated under a clearly erroneous or contrary to law standard). It is hereby

ORDERED that the motions for reconsideration, as outlined above, are DENIED as they are untimely. A motion for reconsideration must be filed within fourteen days after the Court’s determination of the original motion. *See* Local Civil Rule 6.3. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s objections to Judge Gorenstein’s December 18, 2020, Order at Dkt. No. 450 are overruled as they are not clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to mail a copy of this Order to the pro se Plaintiff.

Dated: January 13, 2021
New York, New York


LORNA G. SCHOFIELD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE