

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1365

MICHAEL A. SCOTT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

US BANK NA; MERS CORPORATION, INC., f/k/a Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. ; DLJ MORTGAGE CAPITAL, INC. ; WILCOX & SAVAGE, P.C.; KAUFMAN & CANOLES, P.C.; CONRAD M. SHUMADINE; STANLEY G. BARR, JR.; R. JOHAN CONROD, JR.; CHARLES E. POSTON; WILLIAM M. CLARK; NANCY A. CLARK,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:09-cv-00516-RAJ-DEM)

Submitted: May 18, 2012

Decided: May 29, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael A. Scott, Appellant Pro Se. Stanley Graves Barr, Jr., R. Johan Conrod, Jr., KAUFMAN & CANOLES, PC, Norfolk, Virginia; Christy Monolo, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Michael Scott Stein, STEIN & SMITH, Newport News, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael A. Scott appeals the district court's orders granting the Appellees' motion to dismiss, dismissing his complaint for failing to state a claim, denying his motion for reconsideration and ordering a prefiling injunction. We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and affirm the dismissal for the reasons cited by the district court. See Scott v. US Bank NA, No. 2:09-cv-00516-RAJ-DEM (E.D. Va. Sept. 23, 2010; Oct. 14, 2011; Feb. 17, 2012). We review the court's decision to impose a prefiling injunction for abuse of discretion. See Cromer v. Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc., 390 F.3d 812, 817 (4th Cir. 2004). We agree with the district court that Scott has a history of filing vexatious, repetitious and frivolous lawsuits that impose a considerable burden on the court. Accordingly, we conclude that the prefiling injunction is not overbroad and that the court did not abuse its discretion.

We affirm the district court's orders. We grant Scott's motion to exceed the length limitations for informal briefs. 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