

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-6382

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOHN DOE,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 20-6418

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOHN DOE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Wilmington. Malcolm J. Howard, Senior District Judge. (7:95-cr-00076-H-1)

Submitted: September 8, 2020

Decided: October 23, 2020

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, WYNN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part, vacated in part, and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Doe, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, John Doe appeals the district court's orders granting in part and denying in part his motions to seal. We affirm three of the district court's sealing decisions. First, Doe challenges the portion of the district court's order denying his motion to seal an affidavit attached to a Government brief. Doe also challenges the district court's order declining to seal his motion requesting that the courtroom be sealed for any proceedings related to his sealing requests. We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court did not err in denying the motions to seal these documents. Moreover, while Doe also contends that the district court did not seal a motion to appoint counsel, our review of the record reveals that the district court sealed this document. Therefore, we affirm these portions of the district court's orders.

However, Doe also challenges the district court's denial of his motions to seal the Government's response brief to his motion to discontinue sentence and his "notice of case." Does further contends that the district court erred in denying his motion to proceed by pseudonym. While these appeals were pending, we set forth the relevant standard to apply and the interests to consider when addressing motions such as Doe's. *See United States v. Doe*, 962 F.3d 139, 142 n.1, 145–53 (4th Cir. 2020). The district court did not have the benefit of our decision in *Doe* when ruling on these requests. Accordingly, we vacate these portions of the district court's orders and remand for reconsideration in light of *Doe*.

We deny Doe's motions to appoint counsel and to schedule oral argument. We grant the motion to proceed by pseudonym. 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 IN PART, VACATED IN PART, AND REMANDED