

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

DARIN L. HAUMAN,	:	CIVIL NO. 1:15-CV-1159
	:	
Petitioner	:	(Chief Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
BRIAN V. COLEMAN, <i>et al.</i>,	:	
	:	
Respondents	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 17th day of July, 2017, upon consideration of petitioner’s motion (Doc. 49) for reconsideration, wherein he requests that the court reconsider its order (Doc. 45) denying his motion “to defer submission of a brief in support of the habeas petition and begin fact-developing procedures”, in which the court noted that petitioner had previously filed a reply to respondents’ answer, and it appearing that petitioner fails to demonstrate reliance on one of three major grounds needed for a proper motion for reconsideration, North River Ins. Co. v. Cigna Reinsurance Co., 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995) (stating three major grounds include “(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence [not available previously]; [or], (3) the need to correct clear error [of law] or prevent manifest injustice.”), but, instead, simply disagrees with the court’s

decision¹, see Waye v. First Citizen's Nat'l Bank, 846 F. Supp. 310, 314 (M.D. Pa. 1994) (finding that "[a] motion for reconsideration is not to be used as a means to reargue matters already argued and disposed of."), aff'd, 31 F.3d 1174 (3d Cir. 1994); see also Database America, Inc. v. Bellsouth Adver. & Publ'g Corp., 825 F. Supp. 1216, 1220 (D.N.J. 1993) (citations omitted) (holding "[a] party seeking reconsideration must show more than a disagreement with the Court's decision, and 'recapitulation of the cases and arguments considered by the court before rendering its original decision fails to carry the moving party's burden.'"), it is hereby ORDERED that petitioner's motion (Doc. 49) is DENIED. Upon review of the materials submitted by the parties, the court will determine whether an expanded record or evidentiary hearing is warranted. See R. GOVERNING § 2254 CASES 7, 8(a).

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER

Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania

¹ Petitioner again asserts that his traverse is incomplete in that it does not encompass all of his arguments, and the record is incomplete. (Doc. 50, at 8-9). The court finds that the record contains a wealth of information concerning petitioner's underlying criminal case, and petitioner has had a full and complete opportunity to file a habeas petition and lengthy supplement thereto. (Docs. 1, 24, 25).