Dial v. Johnson Doc. 21

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

VINCENT F. DIAL,

Petitioner.

٧.

Civil Action No. 3:09cv004

GENE M. JOHNSON,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Petitioner, a Virginia prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On June 24, 2009, the Court granted Respondent's motion to dismiss. On July 14, 2009, Petitioner filed a response to the Court's dismissal wherein he requests the Court to reconsider its decision. The Court will treat Petitioner's response as a motion for reconsideration pursuant to Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

A Rule 60(b) motion is not a substitute for a proper appeal. Dowell v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Auto. Ins. Co., 993 F.2d 46, 48 (4th Cir. 1993) (citing Ackerman v. United States, 340 U.S. 193, 198 (1950)). "Rule 60(b) does not authorize a motion merely for reconsideration of a legal issue." Eberhardt v. Integrated Design & Constr., Inc., 167 F.3d 861, 870 (4th Cir. 1999) (quoting United States v. Williams, 674 F.2d 310, 312 (4th Cir. 1982). Where, as here, a litigant seeks merely to re-argue an issue decided adversely to him, relief under Rule 60(b) is inappropriate. See Van Skiver v. United States, 952 F. 2d 1241, 1243 (10th Cir. 1991) (holding dismissal of Rule 60(b) motion proper where motion "basically revisit[ed], albeit in somewhat

¹ Petitioner's response was placed in the mail on July 14, 2009, and is deemed filed as of that date. *Houston v. Lack*, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

different forms, the same issues already addressed and dismissed by the court" because "revisiting the issues already addressed 'is not the purpose of a motion to reconsider" (quoting Van Skiver v. United States, 751 F. Supp. 1522, 1523 (D. Kan. 1990))). Petitioner's motion for reconsideration will be DENIED.

An appropriate Order shall issue.

James R. Spencer
Chief United States District Judge

Date: <u>9-3-09</u> Richmond, Virginia