

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

|                       |   |                            |
|-----------------------|---|----------------------------|
| PHILIP SULLIVAN,      | : |                            |
| CHARLOTTE SULLIVAN,   | : |                            |
|                       | : |                            |
| Plaintiffs,           | : |                            |
|                       | : |                            |
| v.                    | : | Civil No. 3:03cv1203 (MRK) |
|                       | : |                            |
| JEFFREY STEIN, et al, | : |                            |
|                       | : |                            |
| Defendants.           | : |                            |

**RULING AND ORDER**

Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration [**doc. # 160**], Amendment to Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration [**doc. # 163**], and Second Amendment to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Reconsideration [**doc. #166**] are DENIED. Motions for reconsideration are authorized by Rule 7(c) of the *Local Rules of Civil Procedure* of the District of Connecticut. However, the standard for granting a motion for reconsideration is strict. *See Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc.*, 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995). "Such a motion generally will 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." *Id.* A "motion for reconsideration may not be used to plug gaps in an original argument or to argue in the alternative once a decision has been made." *Horsehead Resource Dev. Co., Inc. v. B.U.S. Env'tl. Serv., Inc.* 928 F. Supp. 287, 289 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (internal citations and quotations omitted). Furthermore, a "motion to reconsider should not be granted where the moving party seeks solely to relitigate an issue already decided." *Shrader*, 70 F.3d at 257." Although pro se litigants should be afforded latitude, they generally are required to inform themselves regarding procedural rules and to

comply with them." *LoSacco v. City of Middletown*, 71 F.3d 88, 92 (2d Cir. 1995) (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

Having considered the motion [doc. # 160] and the subsequent amendments [doc. ## 163, 166], the Court concludes that none of these documents presents grounds or reasons that would cause the Court to reconsider its Memorandum of Decision [doc. # 141]. Therefore Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration, as well as the related amendments, are DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/ Mark R. Kravitz  
United States District Judge

Dated at New Haven, Connecticut: November 18, 2004.