

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

APR 27 7 4:36 PM '07
Sc

Wayne Doyle,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:07-cv-003

-vs-

District Judge Thomas M. Rose

John Mc Conagha and the Clark County Library, et al.,

Magistrate Judge Michael Merz

Defendants.

MOTION FOR CLARITY CONCERNING THIS COURTS APRIL 27,2007 DECISION AND ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

IN SUPPORT OF THE FOREGOING AND AFTER

On April 25,2007, Plaintiff Wayne Doyle sought and received the following relief from "THIS COURT"

- 1. Plaintiff sought "(60) DAYS extension, stay (whatever motion) is needed to allow Plaintiff Wayne Doyle an opportunity to get legal counsel."

The Court granted "Plaintiff's time to respond to the pending Amended Motion to Dismiss "(Doc.No.46) is **extended** to and including June,22,2007, whether or .NOT he gets an attorney..

QUESTION FOR CHIEF MAGISTRATE JUDGE MERTZ?

Since This court granted relief for Plaintiff Doyle giving me time to respond to the pending Amended Motion to Dismiss, Why dosen't" the April 27,2007 , decision and order reflect that (IN-PART) the motion was granted?.

Original

Note:

Wayne Doyle
262 Southern Ave
Springfield, OH 45502

Mailed 5/1/2007 to clerk

Time stamped copy to be mailed to:

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN
DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION**

RELIEF SOUGHT

April 27, 2007, decision and order to reflect Plaintiff Doyle's motion for reconsideration
GRANTED IN PART

SERVICE

Mailed to Lois A Gruhin
21 East State Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
This 15th day of May, 2007.

THOUGHT TO CONSIDER

**THE PHRASE "ABUSE OF DISCRETION" COONOTES MORE THAN ERROR
OF LAW OR JUDGMENT; IT IMPLIES THAT THE COURT ATTITUDE IS
UNREASONABLE, ARBITRARY, OR UNREASONABLE.**

Wayne Doyle