

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2498

WILLIAM S. DAVIS, II,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

BABY J.F.D., c/o William S. Davis, II; ESTATE OF WILLIAM
SCOTT DAVIS, SR., Deceased,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALBERT J. SINGER; DANIELLE DOYLE; SYDNEY J. BATCH; BATCH,
POORE & WILLIAMS, LLP; MICHELE JAWORSKI SUAREZ; MELANIE A.
SHEKITA; MICHELLE SAVAGE; ERIC CRAIG CHASSE; LISA SELLERS;
CHARLOTTE MITCHELL; WENDY KIRWAN; SONJI CARLTON; NANCEY
BERSON; DR. SUSAN GARVEY; ROBERT B. RADAR; MARGARET EAGLES;
RICHARD CROUTHARMEL; WAKE COUNTY GOVERNMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith,
Chief District Judge. (4:13-cv-00007-RBS-DEM)

Submitted: April 19, 2016

Decided: April 21, 2016

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Scott Davis, II, Appellant Pro Se. Roger Allen Askew, WAKE COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; James Nicholas Ellis, Lisa Patterson Sumner, POYNER SPRUILL LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Sydney J. Batch, BATCH, POORE & WILLIAMS LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Elizabeth A. Martineau, MARTINEAU KING PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina, Peter Andrew Teumer, ROBEY TEUMER & DRASH, Norfolk, Virginia; Allison Jean Becker, YATES, MCLAMB & WEYHER, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees. Sydney J. Batch, Appellee Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Scott Davis, II, appeals the district court's order denying 4 motions for recusal, 19 motions for relief from judgment pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), and 49 other various motions relating to a closed civil matter. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Davis v. Singer, No. 4:13-cv-00007-RBS-DEM (E.D. Va. filed Oct. 19, 2015 & entered Oct. 20, 2015). We deny Davis' motions for appointment of counsel. 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