

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

DARRELL MORRIS,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-16-1297-D
)	
GOVERNOR MARY FALLIN, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	


ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff’s *pro se* filing, entitled “Motion Appealing Order filed 6/23/17 by the Honorable Timothy D. DeGiusti” [Doc. No. 46]. Liberally construed, Plaintiff moves for reconsideration of the Court’s Order of June 23, 2017 [Doc. No. 43], adopting the magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 34] to dismiss certain claims and parties, and permit Plaintiff to proceed only on the plausible claims stated in the Amended Complaint [Doc. No. 29].

Upon consideration, the Court finds that Plaintiff’s motion to reconsider falls within a district court’s inherent authority to revise interlocutory orders at any time before the entry of a final judgment. *See Warren v. Am. Bankers Ins.*, 507 F.3d 1239, 1243 (10th Cir. 2007); *Riggs v. Scrivner, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1146, 1148 (10th Cir. 1991). The Court further finds, however, that Plaintiff fails to present any proper grounds warranting reconsideration of the prior ruling. *See Servants of Paraclete v. Does*, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2000); *see also United States v. Christy*, 739 F.3d 534, 539 (10th Cir. 2014); *Van Skiver v. United States*, 952 F.2d 1241, 1243 (10th Cir. 1991).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's "Motion Appealing Order filed 6/23/17 by the Honorable Timothy D. DeGiusti" [Doc. No. 46], construed as a motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 1st day of September, 2017.

Handwritten signature of Timothy D. DeGiusti in blue ink.

TIMOTHY D. DEGIUSTI
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE