

)	
JULIO GOMEZ,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 06-1346 (ESH)
)	
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE and)	
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

Plaintiff has moved for reconsideration under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) of the Court’s December 20, 2006 Order, in which the Court dismissed his complaint. “A motion for reconsideration is discretionary and should not be granted unless the movant presents either newly discovered evidence or errors of law or fact which need correction.” *Nat’l Trust v. Dep’t of State*, 834 F. Supp. 453, 455 (D.D.C. 1993) (internal citation omitted). Moreover, the Court should not grant a motion for reconsideration if a party is simply attempting to renew factual or legal arguments that it asserted in the original pleadings. *Id.* “Reconsideration is not simply an opportunity to reargue facts and theories upon which a court has already ruled.” *State of New York v. United States*, 880 F. Supp. 37, 38 (D.D.C. 1995); *see also Assassination Archives & Research Ctr. v. U.S. Dept. of Justice*, 828 F. Supp. 100, 102 (D.D.C. 1993). To succeed on a Rule 59(e) motion, a party must instead demonstrate an “intervening change of controlling law, the availability of new evidence, or the need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” *Virgin Atl. Airways, Ltd. v. Nat’l Mediation Bd.*, 956 F.2d 1245, 1255 (2d Cir. 1992),

cert. denied, 506 U.S. 820 (1982). Plaintiff raises no new theories or facts to persuade the Court to vacate its prior holding. Thus, plaintiff's motion is hereby **DENIED**. No further motions to reconsider will be entertained by this Court.

SO ORDERED.

/s/
ELLEN SEGAL HUVELLE
United States District Judge

Date: January 8, 2007