

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

No. 03-1677C

(Filed January 22, 2008)

WILLIAM P. GREENE,

Plaintiff,

v.

THE UNITED STATES,

Defendant.

ORDER

The Clerk's office received on January 16, 2008, two submissions from Mr. Greene. The first, entitled, "Motion for Transfer to District Court[] for Adjudication of the Remaining Claims of Due Process Violations Under 28 [U.S.C.] 1631," was in response to the Court's December 20, 2007 Order allowing Mr. Greene an opportunity to file a motion to transfer back to the district court the due process claims he alleges are contained in his complaint. Although timely received, this document was inadvertently not filed by the Clerk's office. The Clerk's office is directed to file this motion.

Mr. Greene also submitted a second document entitled, "Motion to Reconsider Claims for Student Loan Repayments." On April 29, 2005, the Court granted the government's motion for judgment on the administrative record concerning Mr. Greene's student loan claims. *Greene v. United States*, 65 Fed. Cl. 375, 384-85 (2005). In a status conference held in this case on July 28, 2005, Plaintiff represented that he intended to file a motion for reconsideration of his student loan claims. The Court, in an order issued August 1, 2005, directed Mr. Greene to include in this motion documentation in support of his claim. The Clerk's office received and filed on September 2, 2005, Mr. Greene's first motion for reconsideration of the Court's judgment pertaining to his student loans. On March 28, 2006, taking into account Mr. Greene's *pro se* status, and the fact that the Corrections Board denied Mr. Greene's claims *sub silentio*, the Court ordered a response from the government regarding the student loan issue. On April 2, 2007, the Court denied Mr. Greene's motion for reconsideration of the student loan repayment issue. Order (Apr. 2, 2007) at 2. On December 20, 2007, the Clerk's office filed a document previously submitted by Mr. Greene that was supposed to be his last reply in support of his cross-motion for judgment on the administrative record. This document, among other things, requested that the Court reconsider its decision regarding the student loan repayment issue. Mr.

Greene's most recent submission appears to be yet another motion by Mr. Greene asking the Court to reconsider its decision granting the government's motion for judgment on the administrative record concerning the student loan issue.

In the most recent submission, Mr. Greene provides no grounds to justify the Court's reconsideration of this decision -- perhaps because at least one page from this document appears to be missing. Accordingly, the Clerk shall return this document to Mr. Greene. If Mr. Greene chooses, he can correct the document by inserting the omitted page or pages and resubmit it for filing. Plaintiff, should, however, take heed of RCFC 59(a), as it would be frivolous to submit a motion that does not attempt to meet the standards of this rule. Reconsideration will **not** be granted unless Mr. Greene meets the reconsideration standards of Rule 59(a) of the U.S. Court of Federal Claims. A motion for reconsideration under RCFC 59(a) is not a vehicle to provide unhappy litigants with an additional opportunity to persuade the Court to accept its arguments. *See Citizens Federal Bank, FSB v. United States*, 53 Fed. Cl. 793, 794 (2002).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

VICTOR J. WOLSKI
Judge