

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1538

JOHN B. KIMBLE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RAJESH K. RAJPAL, M.D.; RAJESH K. RAJPAL, trading as See
Clearly Vision Group, L.L.C.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior
District Judge. (1:13-cv-00298-CMH-IDD)

Submitted: October 30, 2014

Decided: November 14, 2014

Before NIEMEYER and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John B. Kimble, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Clyde Marriner,
COWDREY THOMPSON PC, Easton, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John B. Kimble filed a civil action against Rajesh K. Rajpal, M.D., and related corporate parties, asserting Virginia tort law claims under diversity jurisdiction. The district court dismissed the action for lack of jurisdiction and denied Kimble's subsequent Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion seeking relief from that judgment. Kimble appealed, and we affirmed. Kimble v. Rajpal, 566 F. App'x 261, 263-64 (4th Cir. 2014) (Nos. 13-2140, 14-1024). After our opinion issued, Kimble filed a motion and amended motion "to reinstate and substitute parties," which the district court denied. Kimble also filed a Rule 59(e) motion seeking reconsideration of that order. Kimble now appeals the orders denying these post-appeal motions.

We review these orders for abuse of discretion. See Equal Rights Ctr. v. Niles Bolton Assocs., 602 F.3d 597, 603 (4th Cir. 2010); Robinson v. Wix Filtration Corp., 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010). Our review of the record demonstrates no abuse of discretion, as Kimble was not entitled to reinstate his claims with new parties or to continue the litigation on its merits following our opinion affirming its dismissal. Insofar as Kimble's informal brief raises claims unrelated to the orders at issue in this appeal, these arguments are not properly before us.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. 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