IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

)	
)	
)	Case No. CIV-12-00191-M
)	
))	
))))))))

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Certain of its Motions to Compel Discovery, filed August 19, 2013. On September 10, 2013, defendants filed their Response.

In its February 08, 2013 Order, the Court denied Cactus' Amended Motion to Compel Against Defendants and Cactus' Motion to Compel Production of Witnesses for Depositions and Dates (collectively, "Motion to Compel") as premature for failure to comply with Local Civil Rule 37.1.

In its motion to reconsider, plaintiff asserts that "although the disputes set forth in the Motions to Compel and related briefings are still squarely before the Court in the form of the Defendants' pending motions for protective orders . . ., motions to quash . . ., and the Parties' related briefing thereon, Cactus hereby re-urges [sic] the Motion to Compel out of an abundance of caution to ensure that each and every existing discovery dispute between Cactus and Defendants is ripe for adjudication."

Having reviewed this matter, the Court finds the Motion to Reconsider should be denied. Specifically, the Court finds that plaintiffs motions to compel, filed over seven months ago, were denied by this Court as premature and that plaintiff may not simply reargue said motions through

a motion to reconsider but must file a new motion to compel. In addition, in a separate Order issued on the same date, the Court has disposed of defendants' motions for protective order and motions to quash pertaining to the majority of discovery issues raised by plaintiff in its initial motion to compel, thus, likely rending plaintiff's initial motion moot. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider Certain of its Motions to Compel Discovery [docket no. 185].

IT IS SO ORDERED this _____ day of October, 2013.

VICKI MILES-LaGRANGE

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGI