

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

REED ROGALA,

Defendant.

ORDER

08-cr-84-bbc

Defendant Reed Rogala has filed a third motion to correct clerical errors in his sentence. Like his second motion, this one is called a “motion for reconsideration.” I denied the first motion in an order entered on July 26, 2011, explaining that the alleged “clerical” errors were neither clerical nor erroneous. Instead, they were challenges to the amount of the fine imposed at the time of sentencing and to a condition of supervision requiring defendant to abstain from the excessive use of alcohol. As I told defendant in the order, I have no authority to change the fine amount except under specific circumstances that do not exist at this time, but I advised defendant that once he is on supervised release, his supervising probation officer may request a modification of the fine amount if the officer is persuaded that one is appropriate. The same is true with respect to the condition relating

to alcohol, although I think it is safe to say that no supervising probation officer would ask the court to remove a condition prohibiting a person on supervised release from engaging in the excessive use of alcohol.

Defendant's second motion was denied as duplicative of his first motion. Defendant has had three unsuccessful tries at amending his sentence. His continued efforts to change something that cannot be changed uses up time that could be devoted to the cases of the many other litigants in this court. If he files any more motions on the same ground, the motion will simply be filed without any response to defendant.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that defendant Reed Rogala's second motion for reconsideration of the denial of his motion to correct clerical errors, dkt. #51, is DENIED.

Entered this 4th day of November, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge