

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1270

ALBERT ROBINSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DAVID KEITH OAKS, Esq, individually and as the trustee for The David K. Oaks Personal Trust; THE LAW FIRM OF DAVID K. OAKS, P.A.; SECTION 23 PROPERTY OWNER'S ASSOCIATION, INC., ("Sec 23 one comma") is a fictional, non-existent, ghost corporation; FIVE OAKS INVESTMENTS, INC.; THE DAVID K. OAKS PERSONAL TRUST; DR. D. V. RAO; JOHN E. SPAINHOUR; MCANGUS, GOUDELOCK & COURIE, PLLC; SECTION 23, PROPERTY OWNER'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger, Chief District Judge. (1:21-cv-00123-MR-WCM)

Submitted: June 28, 2022

Decided: June 30, 2022

Before NIEMEYER and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Albert Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. David Keith Oaks, DAVID K. OAKS PA, Saluda, North Carolina; John E. Spainhour, MCANGUS GOUDELOCK & COURIE, PLLC,

Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Albert Robinson appeals the district court's orders affirming the magistrate judge's order denying Robinson's motion to appoint counsel, accepting in part and rejecting in part the recommendation of the magistrate judge, granting in part and denying in part Defendants' motions to dismiss, dismissing Robinson's civil action, and denying Robinson's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion and motion to confirm that Section 23 Property Owner's Association, Inc., has two commas in its name. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. *Robinson v. Oaks*, No. 1:21-cv-00123-MR-WCM (W.D.N.C. filed Feb. 7, 2022; & entered Feb. 8, 2022; Mar. 7, 2022). We deny Robinson's motions to appoint counsel and show cause, and 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