

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, NASHVILLE DIVISION

Mario Bowles # 490357 v. Tennessee Department of Correction, et al.

Bowles v. Tennessee Department of Correction, No. 3:22-cv-00032 · No. 3:22-cv-00032 · Decided March 3,
2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee denies Mario Bowles’s motion for reconsideration and his related motion for the chief district judge to consider the matter. The court construes the reconsideration motion under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59(e) and 60(b), finding no basis for relief. The court also determines that an appeal would not be taken in good faith for purposes of in forma pauperis status, while advising that Bowles may appeal upon payment of the appellate filing fee or seek pauper status directly from the Sixth Circuit.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	3:22-cv-00032
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	After the court dismissed the prisoner's civil-rights action on summary judgment and entered final judgment, the plaintiff moved for reconsideration and filed a motion seeking review by the chief district judge. He also filed a notice of appeal and sought to proceed in forma pauperis.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 59(e) motion is evaluated under the grounds of clear error of law, newly discovered evidence, an intervening change in controlling law, or manifest injustice. Rule 60(b)(6) relief is available only in exceptional or extraordinary circumstances and lies within the district court's broad discretion. For an appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), good faith is assessed objectively by whether the appeal seeks review of a nonfrivolous issue.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential

PARTIES

Mario Bowles # 490357 v. Tennessee Department of Correction,
Andrea Moore, Other defendants

TOPICS

motion for reconsideration prisoners rights civil rights appellate procedure standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

civil rights civil procedure appellate procedure prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Bowles was entitled to relief from the final judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).
2. Whether Bowles was entitled to relief from the final judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), including Rule 60(b)(6).
3. Whether Bowles's duplicative motion for chief district judge consideration should be granted.
4. Whether Bowles's appeal should be certified as taken in good faith for purposes of proceeding in forma pauperis under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3).

HOLDINGS

1. The plaintiff was not entitled to alter or amend the judgment under Rule 59(e) because he identified no clear error of law, newly discovered evidence, intervening change in controlling law, or manifest injustice.
2. The plaintiff was not entitled to relief under Rule 60(b)(6) because he did not identify exceptional or extraordinary circumstances warranting relief from the final judgment.
3. The plaintiff's motion for chief district judge consideration was denied because it sought essentially the same relief as the motion for reconsideration and failed for the same reasons.
4. The plaintiff was not certified to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal because the court found that any appeal from the dismissal would be frivolous and not taken in good faith, although he could appeal by paying the filing fee or seeking relief directly from the Sixth Circuit.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Rule 60(b)(6) only applies in exceptional or extraordinary circumstances where principles of equity mandate relief.” (Section I)

“The test for whether an appeal is taken in good faith is whether the litigant seeks appellate review of an issue that is not frivolous.” (Section II)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Mario Bowles, a prisoner at Whiteville Correctional Facility, brought a pro se civil-rights action. The court adopted a magistrate judge's recommendation granting defendant Andrea Moore leave to file a renewed motion for summary judgment and granting summary judgment, which resulted in dismissal of the action. After final judgment, Bowles asserted that Moore had not complied with applicable procedural rules and asked the court to conduct a de novo review of the record, but he identified no specific qualifying ground for postjudgment relief.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court previously adopted the magistrate judge's report and recommendation, granted Andrea Moore leave to file a renewed summary-judgment motion, granted summary judgment, and dismissed the action. Final judgment was entered on September 9, 2025. The plaintiff then filed a motion for reconsideration, a substantially duplicative motion for chief-judge consideration, and a notice of appeal.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Westerfield v. U.S.*, 366 F. App'x 614, 619 (6th Cir. 2010)
- *GenCorp, Inc. v. Am. Int'l Underwriters*, 178 F.3d 804, 834 (6th Cir. 1999)
- *McGuire v. Warden*, 738 F.3d 741, 750 (6th Cir. 2013)
- *Blue Diamond Coal v. Trustees of United Mine Workers*, 249 F.3d 519, 529 (6th Cir. 2001)
- *Thompson v. Bell*, 580 F.3d 423, 442 (6th Cir. 2009)
- *Tyler v. Anderson*, 749 F.3d 499, 509 (6th Cir. 2014)
- *McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 610 (6th Cir. 1997)
- *Jones v. Bock*, 549 U.S. 199, 203 (2007)
- *Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 445 (1962)
- *Qwens v. Keeling*, 461 F.3d 763, 774-75 (6th Cir.)