

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-7581

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LEE BENTLEY FARKAS,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:10-cr-00200-LMB-1)

Submitted: April 19, 2018

Decided: May 9, 2018

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lee Bentley Farkas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lee Bentley Farkas appeals the district court's orders denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(2) motion and subsequent motion for reconsideration. While Rule 60(b) is not a proper vehicle through which to address Farkas' arguments related to his criminal forfeiture, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 1; *United States v. Mosavi*, 138 F.3d 1365, 1366 (11th Cir. 1998) (per curiam); *United States v. Breit*, 754 F.2d 526, 530 (4th Cir. 1985), we may affirm the district court's orders for any reason appearing on the record, *Weidman v. Exxon Mobil Corp.*, 776 F.3d 214, 220 (4th Cir. 2015). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. As the district court and this Court have repeatedly concluded—and notwithstanding Farkas' most recent contentions—Farkas' efforts to satisfy his forfeiture obligation with the assets of Taylor, Bean, and Whitaker Mortgage Corporation are not properly considered at this juncture. *See Young v. United States*, 489 F.3d 313, 315 (7th Cir. 2007); *United States v. Pelullo*, 178 F.3d 196, 202 (3d Cir. 1999). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. 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