

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6764

JOHN L. CORRIGAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

D. DALE, WSP Trooper; D. BURT, WSP Trooper; A. HILLE,
Judge; B. SCUDDER, Deputy Prosecutor,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior
District Judge. (1:12-mc-00006-CMH-IDD)

Submitted: July 19, 2012

Decided: July 26, 2012

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John L. Corrigan, Appellant Pro Se. Alexander McDonald
Laughlin, WILEY REIN, LLP, McLean, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John L. Corrigan filed a self-styled "Motion for Relief from Judgment or Order" in which he moved the district court to declare as void orders of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Washington granting summary judgment to the Defendants in his civil rights action and awarding Defendants Hille and Scudder \$10,822.51 in attorney's fees. Corrigan argued in the motion for relief that, as the court of registration under 28 U.S.C. § 1963 (2006), the district court had the power to grant him relief from the Eastern District of Washington's erroneous determination that it was not required to dismiss the action without prejudice based his failure to serve Defendants within the time limit prescribed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). The district court denied Corrigan's motion, and he now appeals. We affirm.

The substance of Corrigan's contention in the motion for relief—that the Eastern District of Washington's orders were void because he failed to serve the Defendants in a timely manner—previously was litigated. Corrigan v. Dale, No. 2:07-cv-00227-RHW (E.D. Wash. Nov. 21, 2008). His claim for relief is therefore barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel. See Orca Yachts, L.L.C. v. Mollicam, Inc., 287 F.3d 316, 318 (4th Cir. 2002) (setting forth the principles of claim preclusion and collateral estoppel).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order denying Corrigan's motion for relief. 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