

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-7414

DAVID MEYERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, BIG STONE GAP DIVISION; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ROANOKE DIVISION; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ABINGDON DIVISION; JUDICIAL COUNCIL CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE OF FOURTH CIRCUIT; T. DORTON, Fiscal Tech of Red Onion State Prison; MARCUS ELAM; A. GALIHAR; KAREN STAPLETON; JEFFREY KISER; J. ARTRIP; M. L. COUNTS; L. MULLINS; J. FANNIN; J. D. BENTLEY; K. B. COUNTS; J. H. MIDDLETON; J. KING; TAMMY BARBETTO; W. SWINEY; J. M. MESSER; J. B. MESSER; SHANNON ESCOFFERY; OFFICER ROSE C. STALLARD; T. L. WOODS; R. MULLIS; R. NAUVY; A. KILGORE; F. STANLEY; A. CLEVINGER; L. JUSTICE; C. HOLBROOK; J. BLEDSOE; B. WITT; DR. FOX; DR. EDWARD BOAKYE; C. DICKERSON; D. W. MCCOWAN; C. C. GILBERT; J. E. LYALL; J. MANNOR; HENRY PONTON; C. R. STANLEY; OFFICER STANLEY; OFFICER WELLS; EDWARD GWINN; BRANDY LEWIS; D. STALLARD; L. COLLINS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 18-7418

DAVID MEYERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, ROANOKE DIVISION; HAROLD CLARKE, Director, VADOC,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 18-7423

DAVID MEYERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR HAROLD CLARKE; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT ABINGDON DIVISION; UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT BIG STONE GAP DIVISION; JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF FOURTH CIRCUIT; CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE JAMES N. ISHIDA,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Michael F. Urbanski, Chief District Judge. (7:18-cv-00472-MFU-RSB; 7:18-cv-00474-MFU-RSB; 7:18-cv-00460-MFU-RSB)

Submitted: May 7, 2019

Decided: May 21, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Meyers, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, David Meyers appeals the district court's orders dismissing his petitions for a writ of mandamus. We have reviewed the records and find no abuse of discretion. *See Gurley v. Superior Ct. of Mecklenburg Cty.*, 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969) (stating standard of review). Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Meyers v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 7:18-cv-00472-MFU-RSB (W.D. Va. Nov. 2, 2018); *Meyers v. U.S. Dist. Ct.*, 7:18-cv-00474-MFU-RSB (W.D. Va. Nov. 2, 2018); *Meyers v. Clarke*, 7:18-cv-00460-MFU-RSB (W.D. Va. Nov. 2, 2018). We also deny Meyers' motion to vacate the collection of fees order. 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