

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1852

GLADSTONE A. DAINTY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Theodore D. Chuang, District Judge. (8:16-cv-02755-TDC)

Submitted: December 28, 2017

Decided: January 9, 2018

Before DUNCAN, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jason A. Ostendorf, LAW OFFICE OF JASON OSTENDORF, LLC, Baltimore,
Maryland, for Appellant. Virginia W. Barnhart, Sarah E. Meyer, TREANOR POPE &
HUGHES, P.A., Towson, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gladstone A. Dainty appeals the district court's orders granting Wells Fargo Bank's motion to dismiss and denying Dainty's motion for reconsideration. We review de novo a district court's dismissal of a complaint under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), accepting factual allegations in the complaint as true and "drawing all reasonable inferences in [the plaintiff's] favor." *Mason v. Machine Zone, Inc.*, 851 F.3d 315, 319 (4th Cir. 2017). We review the denial of Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motions for abuse of discretion. *Aikens v. Ingram*, 652 F.3d 496, 501 (2011) (en banc). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *See Dainty v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*, No. 8:16-cv-02755-TDC (D. Md. Feb. 24, 2017; July 7, 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