Burl Anderson Howell v. US Appeal: 16-2184 Doc: 15 Filed: 01/09/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2184

BURL ANDERSON HOWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:14-cv-00898-F)

Submitted: January 5, 2017 Decided: January 9, 2017

Before WILKINSON, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part; affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Burl Anderson Howell, Appellant Pro Se. John Stuart Bruce, Acting United States Attorney, Kimberly Ann Moore, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 406348889

Appeal: 16-2184 Doc: 15 Filed: 01/09/2017 Pg: 2 of 2

PER CURIAM:

Burl Anderson Howell appeals the district court's September 28, 2016 order denying his post-judgment motion as moot. He also seeks to appeal the district court's November 24, 2015 and February 29, 2016 orders dismissing his civil action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and denying reconsideration.

Howell previously appealed, and we previously affirmed, the district court's November 24, 2015 and February 29, 2016 orders. See Howell v. United States, No. 16-1220, 2016 WL 4363146 (4th Cir. Aug. 16, 2016). To the extent that Howell again seeks to appeal these or any earlier orders of the district court, we dismiss the appeal as untimely. As for the district court's September 28, 2016 order denying his post-judgment motion as moot, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Howell's pending motion and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Howell v. United States, No. 5:14-cv-00898-F (E.D.N.C. Sept. 28, 2016).

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.

DISMISSED IN PART;
AFFIRMED IN PART