011 v. 1		
1		FILED IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
2		Jan 30, 2018
3	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
4	KYNTREL JACKSON,	No. 4:17-CV-05189-SMJ
5	Plaintiff,	
6	V.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
7	SHAWNA PATZKOWSKI; R.	
8	ZARAGOZA,	
9	Defendant.	
10	Before the Court, without oral argument, is Plaintiff Kyntrel Jackson's	
11	construed Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 23. Plaintiff sent a letter to the	
12	Court Clerk titled "Request Defendants to be placed back in civil action." The Court	
13	has reviewed the motion and case file and construes this motion as a motion for	
14	reconsideration of its January 12, 2018 Order Dismissing Complaint in Part and	
15	Directing Service of Religious Claims. ECF No. 12. On January 12, 2018, Plaintiff	
16	filed an amended complaint. ECF No. 15. The Court screened the amended	
17	complaint and issued a screening order, Order Dismissing Amended Complaint in	
18	Part and Dismissing Service of Religious	Claims on January, 19, 2018. ECF No.
19	21. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for consideration as it relates to the Court's	
20	January 12, 2018 order on the original complaint is moot.	

ORDER - 1

However, Plaintiff's amended complaint was substantially identical to the 1 original complaint with the exception of an added claim under the Universal 2 Declaration of Human Rights and a construed negligence claim against Chaplain 3 Fred Ivey. See ECF No. 15. The Court's January 19, 2018 screening order dismissed 4 the same claims and defendants for the same reasons, in addition to dismissing the 5 new claim under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the claim against 6 Defendant Ivey. ECF No. 21. Because Plaintiff's construed motion for 7 reconsideration applies equally to the Court's January 19, 2018 screening order, the 8 Court will consider Plaintiff's motion as it applies to the operative amended 9 complaint and screening order. 10

In his motion for reconsideration, Plaintiff asserts that Defendants Aiyeku, 11 Caldwell, Gonzales, Snyder, Sundburg, Holbrook, Roberts, Mink, Schettler, 12 Schneider, and Vernell should remain as defendants. Plaintiff presents no new facts 13 or information for the Court to consider in evaluating his requests. Plaintiff's motion 14 essentially summarizes the allegations made in his complaint (and amended 15 complaint) and asserts that he has "evidence to prove all claims if need be yet was 16 denied to even show evidence in any court related manner." Seeing no reason to 17 disturb previous decisions, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's motion. 18

20

19

ORDER - 2

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:	
2	1. Plaintiff's Construed Motion for Reconsideration, ECF No. 23, is	
3	DENIED.	
4	IT IS SO ORDERED. The Clerk's Office is directed to enter this Order and	
5	provide copies to counsel and pro se party.	
6	<b>DATED</b> this 30th day of January 2018.	
7	an all menderste	
8	SALVADOR MEND ZA, JR. United States District Judge	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
	ORDER - 3	