

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

| | | |
|---|---|--------------------------------------|
| RORY M. WALSH, individually and as Natural Guardian of C.R.W., | : | CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:07-CV-0616 |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff | : | (Judge Conner) |
| v. | : | |
| | : | |
| DR. ROBERT KRANTZ, et al., | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants | : | |

ORDER

AND NOW, this 17th day of March, 2009, upon consideration of *pro se* plaintiff's motion (Doc. 139) for reconsideration of the order of court (Doc. 130) dated February 11, 2009, which denied plaintiff's appeal (Doc. 122) from the magistrate judge's order (Doc. 121) of January 20, 2009, and the court finding that there are no manifest errors of law or fact in the challenged order,¹ see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotniki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) ("The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence . . ."); see also Max's Seafood Café by Lou-Ann, Inc. v.

¹ As this court has previously observed, (see Doc. 158 n.1) plaintiff appears to misapprehend the purpose of a Rule 60 motion for reconsideration. "A motion for reconsideration is not to be used as a means to reargue matters already argued and disposed of or as an attempt to relitigate a point of disagreement between the Court and the litigant." Abu-Jamal v. Horn, No. Civ. A. 99-5089, 2001 WL 1609761, at *9 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 18, 2001); see also Lester v. Percudani, No. 3:01-CV-1182, 2008 WL 4722749, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Oct. 24, 2008) (same). Nor is such a motion a mere opportunity for a "second bite at the apple." Bhatnagar v. Surrendra Overseas Ltd., 52 F.3d 1220, 1231 (3d Cir. 1995). Plaintiff's instant motion (Doc. 139) for reconsideration simply repeats arguments raised on two previous occasions. (See Docs. 90, 123.) The court has considered these arguments and rejected them. It is time for plaintiff to move forward.

Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 139) for reconsideration is DENIED.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge