

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

TERRELL STATON,
Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN HOLZBACH, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 3:20-cv-631 (SRU)

ORDER

Terrell Staton filed the instant motion to reopen the case. *See* Doc. No. 48. Because Staton essentially asks that I vacate my judgment dismissing his complaint, I construe his motion as one for reconsideration pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b).

The standard for granting a motion for reconsideration is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to “an intervening change in controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” *Barnett v. Connecticut Light & Power Co.*, 967 F. Supp. 2d 593, 596 (D. Conn. 2013), *aff’d*, 580 F. App’x 30 (2d Cir. 2014) (cleaned up). A motion for reconsideration may not be used to “advance new facts, issues or arguments not previously presented before the Court, nor may it be used as a vehicle for relitigating issues already decided by the Court.” *Connecticut Com’r of Labor v. Chubb Grp. of Ins. Companies*, 2013 WL 836633, at *1 (D. Conn. Mar. 6, 2013), *aff’d*, Case No. 13-1244 (2d Cir. 2014) (cleaned up).

At the start, I note that motions for reconsideration must be filed within seven days from the filing of the order from which relief is sought. *See* D. Conn. L. Civ. R. 7(c)1. Because the judgment was issued on January 28, 2021 and Staton did not file his motion until February 24, 2021, the motion is untimely.

Moreover, Staton does not set forth a persuasive reason why he should be relieved of the final judgment pursuant to Rule 60(b). In his motion, Staton vaguely contends that the defendants violated his constitutional and statutory rights, that immunity does not extend to Prosecutor Sedensky's actions, and that Judges White and Iannotti were biased and had conflicts of interest during various court proceedings. *See* Doc. No. 48, at 1–2. Those assertions, without more, do not provide me with a proper basis to reconsider or reopen the judgment; Staton does not point to any changes in controlling law, assert the availability of new evidence, or identify a need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.

For the foregoing reasons, the motion is **denied**.

So ordered.

Dated at Bridgeport, Connecticut, this 20th day of April 2021.

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