

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6756

CLARENCE ROULHAC, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

B. S. JANEK, DMD, Dentist, Powhatan Correctional Center,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

PRISON HEALTH SERVICES; LINDA RAY, Ms., Head Nurse,
Powhatan Correctional Center; L. KUMP, Ms., Doctor,
Powhatan Correctional Center; A. TONEY, Mr., Doctor,
Powhatan Correctional Center; FRED SCHILLINGS, Dr., Health
Service Director, VDOC,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District
Judge. (3:10-cv-00408-HEH)

Submitted: September 17, 2013

Decided: October 2, 2013

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clarence Roulhac, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Elizabeth Martin
Muldowney, RAWLS, MCNELIS & MITCHELL, PC, Richmond, Virginia,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Clarence Roulhac, Jr., appeals the district court's order denying his post-judgment "Motion to Remove" his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action to a different division of the Eastern District of Virginia. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Even assuming, without deciding, that the district court misconstrued Roulhac's motion as seeking relief under Rule 59(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, his motion provided no valid basis for transfer of his action to a different court, for recusal of the district court judge, or for relief from the underlying judgment.* Nor does Roulhac's informal brief provide any valid grounds to question our prior opinion affirming the district court's judgment. See Roulhac v. Janek, 518 F. App'x 160 (4th Cir. 2013) (No. 12-7908). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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

* Although we do not rely specifically on the reasons identified by the district court, "we may affirm a judgment for any reason appearing on the record." Republican Party of N.C. v. Martin, 980 F.2d 943, 952 (4th Cir. 1992).