

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-2146

RONALD I. PAUL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; PAUL D. DE HOLCZER, individually and as a partner of the law firm of Moses, Koon & Brackett, PC; G. L. BUCKLES, as Personal Representative of the Estate of Keith J. Buckles and G. L. Buckles individually personal representative Keith J. Buckles; MICHAEL H. QUINN, Individually and as senior lawyer of Quinn Law Firm, LLC; J. CHARLES ORMOND, JR., individually and as partner of the Law Firm of Holler, Dennis, Corbett, Ormond, Plante & Garner; OSCAR K. RUCKER, in his individual capacity as Director, Rights of Way South Carolina Department of Transportation; MACIE M. GRESHAM, in her individual capacity as Eastern Region Right of Way Program Manager South Carolina Department of Transportation; NATALIE J. MOORE, in her individual capacity as Assistant Chief Counsel, South Carolina Department of Transportation; LIENE A. BUCKLES, as Personal Representative of the Estate of G.L. Buckles individually and Liene A. Buckles individually; REGINALD I. LLOYD, in his individual capacity as Circuit Court Judge, Richland County Court of Common Pleas 5th Circuit,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:13-cv-01852-CMC)

Submitted: February 27, 2015

Decided: April 8, 2015

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronald I. Paul, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald I. Paul appeals the district court's orders adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action without prejudice, and denying his motion to reconsider and amend. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error.

Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Paul v. S.C. Dep't of Transp., No. 3:13-cv-01852-CMC (D.S.C. Oct. 8 & 22, 2014). We deny Paul's motion for summary reversal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED