

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

PAMELA BOND,
Plaintiff,

No. 3:14-cv-1155 (SRU)

v.

CONNECTICUT BOARD OF NURSING,
et al.,
Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Pamela Bond filed this action alleging that the Connecticut Board of Nursing and two nurses associated with it discriminated against her by refusing to reinstate her Connecticut license as a registered nurse. I referred the case to Magistrate Judge William I. Garfinkel, who issued a recommended ruling (Doc. #8) under Rule 72(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which I approved and adopted (Doc. #10), dismissing the case without prejudice under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) as frivolous and for failure to state a claim. Ms. Bond filed what she styled an “Objection to Case Dismissal” (Doc. #12) and a notice of appeal (Doc. #13). The Court of Appeals, apparently construing Ms. Bond’s “objection” as a motion for reconsideration, or a motion to alter a judgment, has stayed her appeal pending the motion’s resolution.

The standard for granting such motions is strict. Motions for 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.” *Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). Motions for reconsideration will not be granted where the party merely seeks to relitigate an issue that has already been decided. *Id.* The three major grounds for granting a motion for reconsideration in the Second Circuit are: (1) an intervening change of controlling law, (2) the

availability of new evidence, or (3) the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice. *Virgin Atlantic Airways, Ltd. v. Nat'l Mediation Bd.*, 956 F.2d 1245, 1255 (2d Cir. 1992) (citing 18 Charles A. Wright, Arthur R. Miller & Edward H. Cooper, *Federal Practice & Procedure* § 4478). Construing Ms. Bond's objection as a motion under Rule 59 or 60, I must conclude that it does not meet the high bar necessary for relief. The motion is accordingly denied.

So ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 26th day of February 2015.

/s/ STEFAN R. UNDERHILL
Stefan R. Underhill
United States District Judge