Jefferson v. Suddreth et al Doc. 8

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION 3:07CV237-2-MU

ALFONZO ALEXANDER JEFFERSON)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
M.L. SUDDRETH, Charlotte Meck-	-)
lenburg Police Officer; and)
JANE DOE, Clerk of Court for)
Mecklenburg County District)
Court,)
Defendants.)
	_)

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (document # 6), filed July 10, 2007; and on his Motion to Amend (document # 7), filed July 11, 2007.

A review of the record of this matter reflects that Plaintiff filed a civil rights Complaint in this Court on June 19, 2007, asserting in very conclusory terms, that his rights were violated in connection with his arrest and extradition to South Carolina for a probation violation. Not surprisingly, therefore, on June 20, 2007, the Court dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint for his failure to state a constitutional claim for relief.

By the first of his two Motions, Plaintiff seeks reconsideration based, in part, upon his assertion that his Complaint clearly showed "that he has been denied North Carolina Statutory protections as clearly established in their laws" By his

second Motion, Plaintiff seeks to amend his dismissed Complaint to include various documents as attachments, including a copy of a traffic citation, a copy of a document reflecting his status as a probationer, and copies of several of his travel permits — all of which ironically reflect Plaintiff's express "waive[r] of extradition to the State of South Carolina" and his acknowledgment that he would "not contest any effort by any state to return [him] to the State of South Carolina."

After a careful review of the foregoing documents, the Court has found no basis to disturb its earlier determination that Plaintiff failed to state a constitutional claim for relief.

Furthermore, inasmuch as his case will not be reopened, Plaintiff also will not be allowed to amend his Complaint.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- That Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (document #
 is **DENIED**; and
- 2. That Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (document # 7) is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

Signed: October 8, 2009

Graham C. Mullen

United States District Judge