

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Tommy Young,)	C/A No.: 1:11-2374-CMC-SVH
)	
Petitioner,)	
vs.)	
)	ORDER
Warden Stevenson,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
_____)	

Petitioner, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this petition seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter comes before the court upon Petitioner’s motion for reconsideration of the order denying his motion seeking discovery [Entry #21]. Pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), all pretrial proceedings have been referred to the undersigned.

Motions for reconsideration of interlocutory orders are appropriately granted only in narrow circumstances: (1) the discovery of new evidence, (2) an intervening development or change in the controlling law, or (3) the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice. *American Canoe Ass’n v. Murphy Farms, Inc.*, 326 F.3d 505 (4th Cir. 2003). Petitioner has not identified any of the narrow circumstances appropriate for granting a motion to reconsider. Therefore, Petitioner’s motion for reconsideration is denied. [Entry #21].

IT IS SO ORDERED.

July 26, 2012
Columbia, South Carolina


Shiva V. Hodges
United States Magistrate Judge