

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

JAMES J. KAUFMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY PUGH, CRAIG W. LINDGREN,
SANDRA COOPER, TERRY SHUK,
ISMAEL OZANNE, CAROL GARCEAU
and MARC W. CLEMENTS,

Defendants.

ORDER

11-cv-168-bbc

JAMES J. KAUFMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFFREY PUGH, SANDRA COOPER,
TERRY SHUK, ISMAEL OZANNE,
OFFICER O'CONNELL, CHARLES COLE,
DAN WESTFIELD and SHEILA PATTEN,

Defendants.

ORDER

11-cv-421-bbc

Judgment against plaintiff James Kaufman was entered in both of the above-captioned cases after I granted defendants' motions for summary judgment. (In case no. 11-cv-168-bbc, plaintiff brought claims that defendant prison officials had violated his rights under the

Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act and free exercise and establishment clauses of the United States Constitution by denying his requests for an Atheist study group and a “knowledge thought ring,” as well as refusing to make Atheist books donated by plaintiff available to the inmates at the Stanley prison library. In case no. 11-cv-421-bbc, plaintiff brought First Amendment claims against defendant prison officials for denying him possession of printed materials on the ground that they were pornographic.)

Now plaintiff has filed motions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) to alter or amend the judgment in each case, raising a litany of reasons, both factual and legal, he believes I erred in granting summary judgment to defendants. However, none of plaintiff’s arguments persuade me that I was incorrect in granting defendants summary judgment. Accordingly, I will deny plaintiff’s motions to alter or amend the judgments.

In addition, plaintiff has filed a motion to supplement his Rule 59 motion in case no. 11-cv-168-bbc, stating that he wishes to present new evidence showing that defendants have denied his recent requests for an Atheist ring even though the ring no longer includes the word “knowledge” engraved on it. However, plaintiff’s new requests for a nonengraved ring are not part of the claims litigated in case no. 11-cv-168-bbc, and thus I will deny the motion to supplement. To the extent that plaintiff believes that the rejection of his new requests violates his rights, those issues would have to be litigated in a new lawsuit.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that

1. Plaintiff James Kaufman's motions to alter or amend the judgment in each of the above-captioned cases, dkt. #53 in case no. 11-cv-168-bbc and dkt. #62 in case no. 11-cv-421-bbc, are DENIED.

2. Plaintiff's motion to supplement his Rule 59(e) motion in case no. 11-cv-168-bbc, dkt. #54, is DENIED.

Entered this 19th day of December, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge