

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

DAVID WAYNE VICKERS,)	CASE NO. 1:24 CV 1642
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE DAVID A. RUIZ
)	
v.)	
)	
U.S. ATTORNEY)	ORDER
BRIDGET M. BRENNAN, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On February 19, 2025, this Court dismissed *pro se* Plaintiff David Wayne Vickers's civil complaint against former United States Attorney Bridget M. Brennan, and Assistant United States Attorney Brian McDonough. (R. 6 & 7). Plaintiff filed an objection to the Court's Order, asserting it did not consider the causes of action set forth in his Amended Complaint. (R. 8).¹ Plaintiff is mistaken. The Court's Memorandum and Opinion Order specifically mentioned the Amended Complaint (R. 4), but found that the Amended Complaint, like the initial Complaint, "fails to state a viable cause of action for the foregoing reasons." (R. 6, PageID# 79).

Plaintiff's Objection (R. 8) fails to persuade the Court any error of law occurred and it is, therefore, DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

March 14, 2025

/s/ David A. Ruiz
DAVID A. RUIZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ "Objections" are not available to a District Court's order. The Court construes Plaintiff's submission as a request for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure since it was filed within twenty-eight days of the judgment. *See, e.g., Robinson v. Vigorito, Barker, Patterson, Nichols & Porter, LLP.*, 2019 WL 13417192, at *1 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 20, 2019); *Lagmay v. Nakakuni*, 2018 WL 10593814, at *1 (D. Haw. Feb. 16, 2018).