

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-7031

KATHY REAVES, a/k/a Kathy Juanita Reaves,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KEVIN SCHWEDO, individually; THOMAS SCOTT WILKERSON, individually;
ROBERT BAILES, individually; CHARLES M. DICKENS, individually; KEVIN
THOMAS, individually; LARRY MCNEILL, individually; KATHRYN M.
CREWS, individually; CATHY HAZELWOOD, individually; MARLBORO
COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICE; COUNTY OF MARLBORO; SOUTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
TELECOMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM, NLETS; BILL PHILLIPS, individually;
CHARLES M. COATS, JR., SLED-CJIS,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence.
Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (4:23-cv-01911-TLW)

Submitted: February 27, 2024

Decided: March 1, 2024

Before WILKINSON, WYNN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kathy Juanita Reaves, Appellant Pro Se. Jerome Scott Kozacki, WILLCOX BUYCK &
WILLIAMS, PA, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellees Thomas Scott Wilkerson and

Charles M. Coats, Jr.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kathy Reaves appeals the district court’s order denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion.* We have reviewed the record and discern no abuse of discretion in the denial of this motion. *See Aikens*, 652 F.3d at 501 (stating standard of review). Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s order. *Reaves v. Schwedo*, No. 4:23-cv-01911-TLW (D.S.C. Oct. 10, 2023). 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

* To the extent Reaves seeks to appeal the district court’s order accepting the magistrate judge’s recommendation and dismissing her complaint, that order is not properly before us in this appeal. *See Aikens v. Ingram*, 652 F.3d 496, 501 (4th Cir. 2011) (en banc) (“[A]n appeal from denial of Rule 60(b) relief does not bring up the underlying judgment for review.” (internal quotation marks omitted)).