## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA CHARLOTTE DIVISION 3:15-cv-00068-FDW

MARION LAMONT SHERROD,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
LAWRENCE PARSONS;	)	ORDER
JEFFREY WALL;	)	
KIERNAN SHANAHAN;	)	
K. GOODWIN, Correctional Officer;	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration of the Order finding that his notice of appeal from the order dismissing his pro se civil rights complaint was not timely filed. (Doc. No. 23).

With regard to motions to alter or amend a judgment under Rule 59(e), the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit has stated: "A district court has the discretion to grant a Rule 59(e) motion only in very narrow circumstances: '(1) to accommodate an intervening change in controlling law; (2) to account for new evidence not available at trial; or (3) to correct a clear error of law or to prevent manifest injustice." <u>Hill v. Braxton</u>, 277 F.3d 701, 708 (4th Cir. 2002) (quoting <u>Collison v. Int'l Chem. Workers Union</u>, 34 F.3d 233, 236 (4th Cir. 1994)). Furthermore, "Rule 59(e) motions may not be used to make arguments that could have been made before the judgment was entered." <u>Id.</u> (internal citation omitted). Indeed, the circumstances under which a Rule 59(e) motion may be granted are so limited that "[c]ommentators observe 'because of the narrow purposes for which they are intended, Rule 59(e) motions typically are denied."" Woodrum v. Thomas Mem'l Hosp. Found., Inc., 186 F.R.D. 350, 351 (S.D. W. Va. 1999) (quoting 11 Charles Alan Wright, et al., Federal Practice and Procedure § 2810.1 (2d ed. 1995)).

Petitioner has not shown the existence of the limited circumstances under which a Rule 59(e) motion may be granted.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**. (Doc. No. 25).

SO ORDERED.

Signed: October 20, 2016

tituen St

Frank D. Whitney Chief United States District Judge