

merit. I construe his letter as an untimely motion for reconsideration, which will be denied.

Although plaintiff contends that the court misunderstood his claim, nothing in his letter convinces me that I erred when I dismissed his case in March. Because he is incarcerated, his rights are restrained necessarily. And, as I explained in the March 3 order, the prison's policy of limiting outgoing inmate mail to four pages is a reasonable means of reducing the volume of outgoing mail prison officials must screen for contraband. See, e.g., Lindell v. Frank, 377 F.3d 655, 660 (7th Cir. 2004). If plaintiff disagreed with the court's decision, he was free to litigate his claim on appeal. Instead, he failed to challenge this court's finding that his appeal was taken in bad faith and the appeal was dismissed. There is nothing further to be done.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Kenneth Awe's motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

Entered this 17th day of July, 2006.

BY THE COURT:
/s/
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge