UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————————

No. 17-1057

———————————

RONALD I. PAUL,

        Plaintiff - Appellant,

    v.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATIONS; PAUL D. DE HOLCZER, individually and as a partner of the law firm of Moses, Koon & Brackett, PC; MICHAEL H. QUINN, individually and as senior lawyer of Quinn Law Firm, LLC; OSCAR K. RUCKER, in his individual capacity as Director, Rights of Way South Carolina Department of Transportation; MACIE M. GRESHAM, in her individual capacity as Eastern Region Right of Way Program Manager South Carolina Department of Transportation; NATALIE J. MOORE, in her individual capacity as Assistant Chief Counsel, South Carolina Department of Transportation; J. CHARLES ORMOND, JR., individually and as partner of the Law Firm of Holler, Dennis, Corbett, Ormond, Plante & Garner,

        Defendants - Appellees.

———————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:16-cv-01727-CMC)

———————————

Submitted: May 31, 2017   Decided: June 8, 2017

———————————

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

———————————

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————————

Ronald I. Paul, Appellant Pro Se.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronald I. Paul appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge, dismissing without prejudice his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint, and imposing a prefiling injunction against him. Paul also appeals the court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in either order. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Paul v. S.C. Dep't of Transp.*, No. 3:16-cv-01727-CMC (D.S.C. Nov. 8, 2016 & Jan. 11, 2017). 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