Boldrini v. Wilson et al Doc. 93

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

ANTONELLO BOLDRINI,

Plaintiff,

٧.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:CV-11-1771

(JUDGE CAPUTO)

(MAGISTRATE JUDGE BLEWITT)

MARTIN R. WILSON, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

NOW, this 19th day of February, 2013, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

- (1) Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 65) is **DENIED**.
- (2) Plaintiff's Motion to Subpoena Record Direct to Defendants Martin R. Wilson, D. Peter Johnson, and Jane Doe from Union County, Pennsylvania (Doc. 72) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (3) Plaintiff's Motion to Subpoena Record Direct to Defendant Daniel J. Barrett from Bradford County, Pennsylvania (Doc. 73) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (4) Plaintiff's Motion to Subpoena Record Direct to Defendants William A. Shaw, Jr., and F. Cortez Bell, III, from Clearfield County, Pennsylvania (Doc. 74) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (5) Plaintiff's Motion to Subpoena Record Direct to Defendant Carol Ponce (Doc. 76) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (6) Plaintiff's Motion to Subpoena Record Direct to Pennsylvania State Police Commissioner Regarding Plaintiff's Criminal Record (Doc. 77) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (7) Plaintiff's Motion to the Court for Leave to File his 1-25-2013 Addendum to his Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 79) is **GRANTED**.
- (8) Defendants Martin R. Wilson, Peter D. Johnson, Jane Doe, Daniel J. Barrett, F. Cortez Bell, III, and William A. Shaw, Jr.'s Motion to Stay Discovery and Objections to Plaintiff's Motions to Subpoena Record and/or to Compel Discovery (Doc. 75) is **DENIED as moot**.
- (9) Plaintiff's Motion to Request Oral Argument (Doc. 89) is **DENIED**.¹

/s/ A. Richard Caputo
A. Richard Caputo
United States District Judge

Under M.D. Pa. Local Rule 7.9, "[t]he judge, *in his or her discretion*, may grant oral argument . . . at the request of either or both parties."