

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

ROBERT L. LEWIS and MARY C. LEWIS,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

No. 04-2366-CM

**STATE OF KANSAS and KANSAS STATE)
BANK COMMISSIONER OFFICE,)**

Defendants.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This case is before the court on plaintiff Robert L. Lewis's¹ Motion to Reverse Court Decision Which is Based Upon Defense's Erroneous and Frivolous (sic) Information (Doc. 54) ("Motion to Reverse") and Motion to Show Defense's (sic) Verification of the Lower Court's Intent to Perform the Manifest Injustice as Proclaimed (Doc. 56) ("Motion to Show"). Plaintiff has filed several motions seeking reconsideration of the court's May 24, 2005 Memorandum and Order dismissing this case. The court denied plaintiffs' most recent motion on April 10, 2007.

In plaintiff's Motion to Reverse, he objects to the court's April 2007 order, arguing that the court "refused to respect the plaintiffs' evidence being provided" and again asks the court to reconsider the merits of this case. In his Motion to Show, he misinterprets defendant's response to his Motion to Reverse as a motion to "deny this case" and asks the court to consider the merits of the

¹ Plaintiff argues that his previous and current motions were filed on behalf of himself and his co-plaintiff Mary C. Lewis. As the court stated in its last order, Mr. Lewis is *pro se* and cannot represent his co-plaintiff. Both motions were signed and filed only by Mr. Lewis. Ms. Lewis is not a party to either motion and cannot be represented by Mr. Lewis *pro se*.

case.

Plaintiff has filed more than seven motions asking, in one form or another, for the court to reconsider its May 2005 order dismissing this case. As explained in the court's April 2007 order, plaintiff's recent filings are not the appropriate vehicle for reconsideration of the court's previous ruling dismissing this case. The court determined that it lacks jurisdiction over plaintiffs' claims. If plaintiff feels aggrieved by the court's order, he should evaluate whether an appeal to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals is available and/or appropriate.

After considering the record, the court finds plaintiff's present motions to be repetitious to motions previously considered and denied. Plaintiff is warned that any further repetitious or frivolous filings, including those attempting to reconsider the court's decision dismissing this case for lack of jurisdiction, may result in the imposition of sanctions against him or the restriction of future filings.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's Motion to Reverse Court Decision Which is Based Upon Defense's Erroneous and Frivolous (sic) Information (Doc. 54) is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Motion to Show Defense's (sic) Verification of the Lower Court's Intent to Perform the Manifest Injustice as Proclaimed (Doc. 56) is denied.

Dated this 30th day of May 2007, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ Carlos Murguia
CARLOS MURGUIA
United States District Judge