

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

<p><b>JOSEPH V. LIBRETTI, JR.,</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Plaintiff,</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">vs.</p> <p><b>STEVEN WOODSON,</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Defendant.</b></p>	<p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p> <p>)</p>	<p><b>CASE NO. 1:13 CV 932</b></p> <p><b>JUDGE DAN AARON POLSTER</b></p> <p><b><u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u></b></p> <p><b><u>AND ORDER</u></b></p>
---	---	--

Before the Court is “Plaintiff’s Motion Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) to Alter or Amend this Court’s December 17, 2013 Order and Judgment Dismissing the Complaint.” (**Doc #: 40** (“Motion”)). The Court has reviewed the Motion and Defendant’s Brief in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion etc. (Doc #: 41 (“Opposition Brief.”)). The Court notes only that a review of the docket in this case shows that Plaintiff has needlessly taxed public and private resources in litigating this case.<sup>1</sup> That practice in the district court ends today. Accordingly, for the reasons accurately and succinctly stated in the Opposition Brief, the Court **DENIES** the Motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/ Dan A. Polster    January 27, 2014  
**Dan Aaron Polster**  
**United States District Judge**

---

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, Plaintiff’s attempt to file five amended complaints and frivolous motions such as “Plaintiff’s Motion to Strike Defendant’s Reply to Plaintiff’s Brief in Opposition to Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss” (Doc #: 36).