

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

*Plaintiff,*

vs.

Case No. 19-10114-EFM

JEREMY VOS,

*Defendant.*

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Jeremy Vos's Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 43). He seeks the Court's reconsideration of its earlier decision denying his motion for compassionate release from prison. The Court denies Defendant's motion.

**I. Factual and Procedural Background**

On December 19, 2019, Defendant pleaded guilty to bank robbery, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2113(a). On March 6, 2020, Defendant was sentenced to 30 months' imprisonment. On October 23, 2020, Defendant filed a sealed motion seeking early release from prison due to underlying health conditions that raised the risk of severe illness should he contract COVID-19. Defendant was represented by counsel.<sup>1</sup> The Court denied his motion finding that he did not

---

<sup>1</sup> The Federal Public Defender ("FPD") undertook the representation of Defendant.

present an extraordinary or compelling reason warranting release and that the sentencing factors enumerated in 18 U.S.C. § 3553 did not support release. Defendant, now proceeding pro se, is before the Court seeking reconsideration of that order.

## II. Legal Standard

Although the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure do not specifically provide for motions to reconsider, the Tenth Circuit allows them.<sup>2</sup> The standards governing them are the same standards that govern civil motions for reconsideration.<sup>3</sup> The Court can alter its judgment “where the court has misapprehended the facts, a party’s position, or the law.”<sup>4</sup> A motion for reconsideration allows the Court to correct clear errors of law or fact or to review newly discovered evidence.<sup>5</sup>

## III. Analysis

In this case, Defendant does not identify or provide any valid reason for the Court to reconsider or amend its prior decision and judgment. Instead, Defendant seeks reconsideration on unrelated issues affecting his incarceration.<sup>6</sup> Defendant fails to identify to the Court an appropriate reason to reconsider its prior decision.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Defendant’s Motion for Reconsideration (Doc. 43) is **DENIED**.

---

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. Christy*, 739 F.3d 534, 539 (10th Cir. 2014).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* (citing *Servants of Paraclete v. Does*, 204 F.3d 1005, 1012 (10th Cir. 2000)).

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

<sup>6</sup> Defendant states that he has not taken a skills program in prison and has not had access to religious services due to COVID-19.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated this 2nd day of March, 2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Eric F. Melgren". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized "E" and "M".

ERIC F. MELGREN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE