

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

JEFFREY MOORE

v.

ATTORNEY MICHAEL P. BOWLER, et al.

Case No. PRISONER
3:08CV668 (JCH)

RULING ON PENDING MOTIONS

On May 27, 2008, the court denied plaintiff's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* because the plaintiff had over \$1,700.00 in his prison bank account and directed plaintiff to submit the filing fee within thirty days. The plaintiff now asks the court to reconsider its ruling denying the motion to proceed and has also submitted a new application to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

The standard for granting a motion for reconsideration is strict. See Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). A motion for reconsideration permits the court "to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to consider newly discovered evidence" LoSacco v. City of Middletown, 822 F. Supp. 870, 876-77 (D. Conn. 1993), aff'd, 33 F.3d 50 (2d Cir. 1994) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

Plaintiff fails to specify any errors of fact or law in the court's ruling. Instead, he claims that he is unable to pay the filing fee because he has been discharged from prison and in a two month period spent all of the \$1,700.00 dollars he had in his prison account to pay debts he owed creditors and to pay child support. The Motion for Reconsideration [**doc. #5**] is **DENIED**.

Plaintiff has submitted a financial affidavit indicating that he is not employed and has no other source of income and has monthly obligations of \$100.00 in child support. Based on this information, the renewed Application to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* [doc. # 4] is **GRANTED**.

SO ORDERED in Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 15th of October, 2008.

/s/ William I. Garfinkel

William I. Garfinkel
United States Magistrate Judge