

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1778

WILLIAM C. BOND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHNNY L. HUGHES, United States Marshal; UNKNOWN NAMED
MARYLAND U.S. JUDGES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. David A. Faber, Senior District Judge.
(1:15-cv-00199-DAF)

Submitted: December 12, 2016

Decided: December 20, 2016

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William C. Bond, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew Paul Phelps, OFFICE
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William C. Bond appeals from the district court's November 24, 2015, order dismissing his civil action and the court's April 8, 2016, order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment, confining his appeal to the court's dismissal of count II of his complaint, which sought qui tam relief on behalf of the Government under the False Claims Act (FCA). We affirm.

Count II of Bond's complaint was subject to dismissal because a pro se litigant may not pursue a qui tam action on behalf of the Government under the FCA. See Gunn v. Credit Suisse Grp. AG, 610 F. App'x 155, 157 (3d Cir. 2015); Nasuti v. Savage Farms Inc., No. 14-1362, 2015 WL 9598315, at *1 (1st Cir. Mar. 12, 2015); Jones v. Jindal, 409 F. App'x 356 (D.C. Cir. 2011); United States ex rel. Mergent Servs. v. Flaherty, 540 F.3d 89, 93 (2d Cir. 2008); Timson v. Sampson, 518 F.3d 870, 873-74 (11th Cir. 2008) (per curiam); Stoner v. Santa Clara Cty. Office of Educ., 502 F.3d 1116, 1126-28 (9th Cir. 2007); United States ex rel. Lu v. Ou, 368 F.3d 773, 775-76 (7th Cir. 2004), abrogated on other grounds by United States ex. rel Eisenstein v. City of New York, 556 U.S. 928 (2009); United States v. Onan, 190 F.2d 1, 6-7 (8th Cir. 1951). We also find no reversible error in the district court's denial of Bond's Rule 59(e) motion. See Mayfield v. Nat'l Ass'n for Stock Car

Auto Racing, Inc., 674 F.3d 369, 378 (4th Cir. 2012) (stating standard of review and circumstances under which Rule 59(e) motion may be granted). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. Bond v. Hughes, No. 1:15-cv-00199-DAF (D. Md. Nov. 24, 2015 & Apr. 8, 2016).

We deny Bond's motions to recuse all Fourth Circuit judges and transfer and to appoint counsel and expedite decision. 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