

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1129

ARTHUR LEE GOODEN, II,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; BARACK
HUSSEIN OBAMA; TONYA R. HENDERSON-STITH; CHRISTOPHER W.
HUTTON; BONNIE L. JONES; TIMOTHY FISHER; VINCENT H. CONWAY;
ALBERT PATRICK; GARY MILLS; BRYANT LEE SUGG; RICHARD KURNS;
ALFRED MASTERS; PAMELA JONES; WILLIAM H. SHAW; PETER
TRENCH; MATHEWS; NELSON T. OVERTON; JANE & JOHN DOES,
1-100; JANE & JOHN DOES, A-Z (all officers of the
Commonwealth of Virginia); JANE & JOHN DOES, I-X; JANE &
JOHN DOES, A-Z (all officers of the United States),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Mark S. Davis, District
Judge. (4:13-cv-00126-MSD-TEM)

Submitted: May 5, 2014

Decided: May 21, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Arthur Lee Gooden, II, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Arthur Lee Gooden, II, appeals the district court's order denying his motion for reconsideration of its order dismissing his civil complaint and denying multiple post-judgment filings. On review of the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying relief pursuant to either Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) or Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) and did not err in declining to grant Gooden's other post-judgment demands. See Robinson v. Wix Filtration Corp., 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010) (standard of review for Rule 59(e)); MLC Auto., LLC v. Town of S. Pines, 532 F.3d 269, 277 (4th Cir. 2008) (standard of review for Rule 60(b)). Accordingly, we affirm based on the reasoning of the district court. Gooden v. United States, No. 4:13-cv-00126-MSD-TEM (E.D. Va. filed Dec. 6 & entered Dec. 9, 2013). We deny Gooden's motion to seal the attachment to his motion filed on April 15, 2014. 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