

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

STERLING THOMPSON,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 07-1034-JTM

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,  
Commissioner of Social Security  
Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

On June 29, 2009, the Court entered an Order (Dkt. 57) denying pro se plaintiff Sterling Thompson's request for leave to file a third Motion for Reconsideration. After that Order, Thompson filed additional motions, entitled "Motion and Notice for Leave to File Voluntary Dismissal Motion for Stay Execution from Judgment without Prejudice Stipulated Pending Motion for Relief of Judgment and Order Rule 60(b)," (Dkt. 58) and "Motion for Reconsideration and Motion for Relief and Judgment and Order Pursuant to Federal Rule Civil Procedure Rules 59(e) and 60(B)." (Dkt. 59). Immediately prior to the Court's Order, Thompson submitted another motion, entitled "Motion for Leave to File Stay in Execution of Proceeding to Motion Responses and Judgment Motion to Correct Dates, Statements, and Claims in thr [sic] Record." (Dkt. 56).

Thompson's arguments are confused, but the apparent intent of all of these motions is to obtain reconsideration of the Court's prior determination that no relief should be awarded to the plaintiff. As such, these motions fail for the reasons stated in the Court's prior Orders denying relief to the plaintiff. Thompson makes no valid argument which would justify the relief sought, and all pending motions are accordingly denied.

In addition, the Court hereby notifies plaintiff that filing restrictions will be imposed if he files any other motion seeking reconsideration of the Court's prior Orders. No litigant has the right of unlimited access to the courts. *In re Winslow*, 17 F.3d 314, 315 (10th Cir. 1994). This Court has the authority to impose filing restrictions on a *pro se* litigant who abuses the privilege of that status. *Werner v. Utah*, 32 F.3d 1446, 1447 (10th Cir. 1994). *See, e.g. Zhu v. Federal Housing Finance Bd.*, No. 04-2539-KHV, 2007 WL 1266887 (D. Kan. May 1, 2007) (imposing filing limitations).

IT IS ACCORDINGLY ORDERED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2009 that the plaintiff's pending motions (Dkt.No's 56, 58, 59) are hereby denied.

s/ J. Thomas Marten  
J. THOMAS MARTEN, JUDGE