

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6539

CARL BLAKE BROCK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CATHERINE BOWMAN, Radiology Tech,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

DONALD PEITRISKO, SIS Lieutenant John Doe 4; JOHN DOE 2, Correctional Officer; MARSHALL SHEARER, Correctional Officer John Doe 1; BRETT FRIEND, Registered Nurse; M. AZUMAH, Mid Level Practitioner; PATRICIA CORBIN, Physician's Assistant; JORGE S. VASQUEZ, Medical Doctor; BRIAN YUNG, Medical Doctor; ALISON WILSON, Medical Doctor; HECTOR LOPEZ, Medical Doctor; VALERIE SMITH, Physician's Assistant; DONARDO FONTE, Physician's Assistant; ARUNAVA SAHA, Mid Level Practitioner; LORENZO GUEVARA, Asst. Health Serv. Adm.; L. FUERTES-ROSARIO, Health Serv. Admin.; W. E. MACKELBURG, Admn Rem Cord; PENNY RICE, Secretary; R. A. BLOCKER, Clinical Director; JASON ELLIOT, Correctional Officer John Doe 3,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (5:10-cv-02821-MGL)

Submitted: August 28, 2014

Decided: September 3, 2014

Before WILKINSON, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carl Blake Brock, Appellant Pro Se. Walter S. Ameika, Jr., LAW OFFICES OF WALTER S. AMEIKA, JR., North Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carl Blake Brock appeals the district court's entry of judgment against him in this action filed pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). Specifically, he challenges the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying Brock's motions for a default judgment and partial summary judgment against Catherine Bowman. Upon review of the record, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Brock's motion for default. See Colleton Prep. Acad., Inc. v. Hoover Universal, Inc., 616 F.3d 413, 417 (4th Cir. 2010) (stating standard of review). Any doubts about whether to grant a default judgment should be resolved in favor of deciding a case on the merits. Tolson v. Hodge, 411 F.2d 123, 130 (4th Cir. 1969). The partial summary judgment motion is, in essence, a repetition of Brock's arguments for a default judgment. Accordingly, finding no merit in the issues Brock raises on appeal, we affirm the judgment of the district court. 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