

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1736

ALBERT M. HARGROVE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DETLEF STEINER, Individually and Professionally Clarendon National Insurance Co.; MIDWESTERN INSURANCE ALLIANCE, INCORPORATED; CATHY ANN NEW, Individually and Professionally Midwestern Insurance Alliance, Inc.; NORMAN E. RISEN, Individually and Professionally Midwestern Insurance Alliance, Inc.; BATTS TEMPORARY SERVICE, INCORPORATED, d/b/a Labor Works Source, Incorporated; CLARENDON NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY; CLARENDON INSURANCE GROUP, INCORPORATED, Clarendon National Insurance Co., Clarendon America Insurance Co., Redland Insurance Company, Harbor Speciality Insurance Co.; HANNOVER LIFE REASSURANCE COMPANY OF AMERICA; HANNOVER RUCKVERSICHERUNGS-AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT, Clarendon National Insurance Company, The Clarendon Group, Hannover Life Reassurance Company of America; GEORGE GLENN, II, Deputy Commissioner, Individual and Official Capacity, and the N.C. Industrial Commission by and through the N.C. Department of Commerce; BUCK LATTIMORE, Official Capacity and the N.C. Industrial Commission by and through the N.C. Department of Commerce,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, Chief District Judge. (CA-04-304-5-FL)

Submitted: November 30, 2005

Decided: January 4, 2006

Before LUTTIG and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Albert M. Hargrove, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer Susan Jerzak, HEDRICK, EATMAN, GARDNER AND KINCHELOE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Perry Cleveland Henson, Jr., HENSON & HENSON, L.L.P., Greensboro, North Carolina; Scarlett Kaye Gardner, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Albert M. Hargrove appeals (1) the district court's June 3, 2005 order denying his motion for the issuance of a subpoena duces tecum; and (2) the district court's June 20, 2005 order denying his motions for relief from judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b); to recall or stay the mandate; and to establish the admission of contested and uncontested facts. We affirm all of the district court's orders. We further deny all of Hargrove's pending motions, including his motions to consolidate, motion for appointment of counsel, motion to compel discovery, motion to separate the documents within the briefs, motion to compel arbitration or alternatively, to compel mediation, motion to supplement the reply brief, and any other motions pending in this appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED