

KRISTOFER THOMAS KASTNER,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) **Case No. 10-1012-EFM**
)
 INTRUST BANK, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)
)

On May 31, 2012, the court granted in part and denied in part plaintiff's various motions to compel. (Memorandum and Order, Doc. 139). This matter is before the court on plaintiff's "motion for reconsideration on discovery." (Doc. 142).

- (1) an intervening change in controlling law;
- (2) the availability of new evidence; or
- (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.

“Such motions are not appropriate if the movant only wants the court to revisit issues already addressed or to *hear new arguments or supporting facts that could have been presented originally.*” Keys Youth Services v. City of Olathe, Kansas, 67 F. Supp.2d 1228, 1229 (D. Kan. 1999)(emphasis added).

Plaintiff's motion and supporting arguments do not address the three grounds for seeking reconsideration listed in Rule 7.3. Instead, plaintiff reargues his requests for answers to certain interrogatories and the production of certain records. Under the circumstances, the court declines the invitation to reconsider the earlier ruling.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's "motion for reconsideration" (**Doc. 142**) is **DENIED**.

Dated at Wichita, Kansas this 23rd day of July 2012.

S/ Karen M. Humphreys

KAREN M. HUMPHREYS
United States Magistrate Judge