

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6058

KENNETH V. AWE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE; LESLIE J. FLEMING; YVONNE M. TAYLOR; MR.
JUSTUS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior
District Judge. (7:12-cv-00546-JLK-RSB)

Submitted: March 27, 2014

Decided: April 1, 2014

Before MOTZ, Circuit Judge, and HAMILTON and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kenneth V. Awe, Appellant Pro Se. James Milburn Isaacs, Jr.,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth V. Awe appeals the district court's orders denying his motion to compel discovery, granting summary judgment in favor of the defendants in Awe's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action, and denying relief from that judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in Awe's informal brief. 4th Cir. R. 34(b). We review the district court's rulings on discovery matters for abuse of discretion. Carefirst of Md., Inc. v. Carefirst Pregnancy Ctrs., Inc., 334 F.3d 390, 396 (4th Cir. 2003). Our review of the record leads us to conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Awe's motion.

Turning to the underlying judgment, we review the district court's grant of summary judgment de novo, "viewing the facts and drawing all reasonable inferences therefrom in the light most favorable to [the nonmoving party]." PBM Prods., LLC v. Mead Johnson & Co., 639 F.3d 111, 119 (4th Cir. 2011). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the court's grant of summary judgment. Accordingly, we affirm this order for the reasons stated by the district court. Awe v. Clarke, No. 7:12-cv-00546-JLK-RSB (W.D. Va. Nov. 12, 2013). Further, we find no abuse of discretion in the court's denial of Rule 59(e) relief from this order. See Robinson v. Wix

Filtration Corp., 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010) (stating standard of review).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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