

FILED: June 20, 2014

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2524

(1:13-cv-00558-GBL-JFA)

JERRY A. HURST

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

GUY HARBERT, in his individual and official capacities;
MAXWELL WIEGARD, in his individual and official capacities;
MARTY HARBIN, in his individual and official capacities;
COLIN SHALK, in his individual and official capacities;
NICHOLAS SKILES, in his individual and official capacities;
STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY; DOES 1-10,

Defendants - Appellees

O R D E R

The Court amends its opinion filed June 20, 2014, as follows:

On page 1, the panel members are corrected to remove the name "DIAZ," and replace it with the name "SHEDD."

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

ON REHEARING

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-2524

JERRY A. HURST,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GUY HARBERT, in his individual and official capacities;
MAXWELL WIEGARD, in his individual and official capacities;
MARTY HARBIN, in his individual and official capacities;
COLIN SHALK, in his individual and official capacities;
NICHOLAS SKILES, in his individual and official capacities;
STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY; DOES 1-10,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District
Judge. (1:13-cv-00558-GBL-JFA)

Submitted: May 30, 2014

Decided: June 20, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerry A. Hurst, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jerry A. Hurst seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his complaint filed pursuant to the Driver's Privacy Protection Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 2721-2725 (2012), and denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeal for the reasons stated by the district court. Hurst v. Harbert, No. 1:13-cv-00558-GBL-JFA (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2013 & Nov. 22, 2013). 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.

DISMISSED