

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
MACON DIVISION

|                              |   |                              |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| WILLIE JAMES ATMORE,         | : |                              |
|                              | : |                              |
| Plaintiff,                   | : |                              |
|                              | : |                              |
| v.                           | : | CASE NO. 5:25-CV-521-CAR-ALS |
|                              | : |                              |
| DR. MOHOMED, <i>et al.</i> , | : |                              |
|                              | : |                              |
| Defendants.                  | : |                              |
| _____                        | : |                              |

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration [Doc. 8] of the Court's Order [Doc. 4] dismissing Plaintiff's case without prejudice because he failed to respond to the Court's order to file a signed complaint. After the case was dismissed, Plaintiff filed three affidavits and a motion for reconsideration but did not sign and refile his complaint.

"[R]econsideration of a previous order is an extraordinary remedy to be employed sparingly."<sup>1</sup> This Court's Local Rule 7.6 provides that motions for reconsideration should not be filed as a matter of routine practice, but only when "absolutely necessary." Reconsideration is appropriate "only if the movant demonstrates [1] that there has been an intervening change in the law, [2] that new evidence has been discovered which was

---

<sup>1</sup> *Groover v. Michelin North America, Inc.*, 90 F. Supp. 2d 1236, 1256 (M.D. Ala. 2000).

not previously available to the parties in the exercise of due diligence, or [3] that the court made a clear error of law.”<sup>2</sup> However, “[a] motion for reconsideration does not provide an opportunity to simply reargue the issue the Court has once determined.”<sup>3</sup>

Plaintiff’s filings are almost illegible and present no discernable basis for this Court to reconsider its previous Order. Accordingly, the Court hereby **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion [Doc. 8].

**SO ORDERED**, this 28th day of August, 2026.

S/ C. Ashley Royal  
C. ASHLEY ROYAL, SENIOR JUDGE  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

---

<sup>2</sup> *McCoy v. Macon Water Authority*, 966 F. Supp. 1209, 1222–23 (M.D. Ga.1997).

<sup>3</sup> *Pennamon v. United Bank*, No. 5:09-CV-169 (CAR), 2009 WL 2355816, at \*1 (M.D. Ga. July 28, 2009) (quotation omitted).