

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

PHILIP KOKOSKA

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF HARTFORD, et al.

Defendants.

No. 3:12-cv-01111 (WIG)

RULING ON PLAINTIFF’S OBJECTION TO THE COURT’S SEPTEMBER 23, 2014 ORDER

Plaintiff has filed an objection to that portion of the Court’s Order [Doc. # 132] granting Defendants’ Motion in Limine to exclude the Hartford Police Department policies regarding TASERS and the use of less lethal force. Because this case has been transferred to this Magistrate Judge for disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), this Ruling is not subject to review by a District Judge. Accordingly, the Court has treated Plaintiff’s objection as a motion for reconsideration.

As the Second Circuit held in *Shrader v. CSX Transportation, Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995), “[t]he standard for granting such a motion is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked - matters, in other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.”

Here, Plaintiff simply rehashes the same arguments considered and rejected by the Court in its initial ruling. Plaintiff has cited to one new decision, *Vazquez v. City of New York*, No. 10-CV-6277, 2014 WL 4388497 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 5, 2014), but that case is distinguishable. *Vazquez*

involved a motion to preclude the plaintiff's proposed expert's testimony on police practices and standards based upon his 31 years of experience with the New York Police Department. *Id.* at

*12. It did not involve the admissibility of specific policies of the NYPD.

Accordingly, the Court finds no basis for granting reconsideration and adheres to its previous ruling.

SO ORDERED, this 22nd day of October, 2014, at Bridgeport, Connecticut.

/s/ William I. Garfinkel

WILLIAM I. GARFINKEL

United States Magistrate Judge