

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

NATHAN GILLIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

G. GRAMS, CAPT. ASHWORTH,
SGT. MORRISON, LT. JOANNE LANE,
RICK RAEMISCH and JOHN DOES 1-5,

Defendants.

ORDER

09-cv-245-bbc

Plaintiff Nathan Gillis, a prisoner at the Columbia Correctional Institution, is proceeding on claims that (1) defendant Anthony Ashworth violated his right to due process by filing a false conduct report against him; (2) defendants Greg Grams and Rick Raemisch ignored his complaints about Ashworth; (3) defendant Joanne Lane violated his right to due process by holding an unfair disciplinary hearing; (4) defendants Grams and Sgt. Morrison subjected him to inhumane conditions of confinement in the DS-1 unit in violation of the Eighth Amendment; and (5) John Doe defendants destroyed plaintiff's religious items in violation of the First Amendment and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act.

Now before the court are plaintiff's requests for reconsideration of several of Magistrate Judge Stephen L. Crocker's orders. Dkt. ##148 and 160. Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A), I may reconsider a pretrial motion where the magistrate judge's order is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

First, plaintiff asks for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order of July 27, 2010, requiring plaintiff to pay defendants \$290.00 for their reasonable expenses incurred in responding to his motion to compel. A review of the record in this case indicates that this award of reasonable expenses was neither clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Because plaintiff asked for reconsideration, the magistrate judge reserved a ruling on plaintiff's motion to pay the award in installments. Dkt. #147. In response defendants moved for an order requiring plaintiff to pay the full amount immediately. Dkt. #159. Because plaintiff has submitted no documentation that he is indigent I will deny his motion to pay the amount in installments and grant defendants motion for plaintiff to pay the full amount immediately.

Second, plaintiff asks the court to reconsider all of the magistrate judge's orders concerning plaintiff's request for inspection of the segregation unit, but he does not identify specific orders to which he objects. The magistrate judge has issued numerous discovery orders in this case. I cannot tell which specific orders plaintiff wishes reconsidered, so I will deny this motion for reconsideration at this time.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff's motions to reconsider the Magistrate Judge's orders, dkt. ##148 and 160, are DENIED.

2. Plaintiff's motion to pay defendants \$290 for reasonable expenses in installments, dkt. # 147, is DENIED.

3. Defendants' motion for plaintiff to pay the \$290 immediately, dkt. #59, is GRANTED.

Entered this 17th day of August, 2010.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge