

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-7499

WILLIAM DEVON DICKEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SCDC; WARDEN COHEN; NURSE WITE; OFFICER HARRIS; DOCTOR
LEMON; DOCTOR ROBERTS, Optical Lab; NURSE GRIMES; NURSE
SIMMONS; LIEUTENANT MAZE; LIEUTENANT BRYANT; SERGEANT
DEVIN WILLIAMS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

EYE CLINIC; OFFICER WILL,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort.
Donald C. Coggins, Jr., District Judge. (9:17-cv-02194-DCC)

Submitted: April 7, 2020

Decided: April 23, 2020

Before HARRIS and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Devon Dickey, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Devon Dickey appeals the district court's order denying his motions for reconsideration of its order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2018) complaint. Although we grant Dickey's pending motion "to support further assertion of facts and arguments presented in Informal Brief," we affirm the district court's order.

We review the order under an abuse of discretion standard. *Aikens v. Ingram*, 652 F.3d 496, 501 (4th Cir. 2011) (en banc); *Robinson v. Wix Filtration Corp. LLC*, 599 F.3d 403, 407 (4th Cir. 2010). After reviewing the record, we find no reversible error. The district court evaluated Dickey's motions for reconsideration under Rules 59(e) and 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The court found that Dickey presented no evidence of "a clear error of law or a manifest injustice," *Robinson*, 599 F.3d at 407, nor "any other reason that justifies relief." Rule 60(b)(6). Dickey failed to exhaust all available administrative remedies before filing his lawsuit, as required by the Prison Litigation Reform Act. 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(a). Although Dickey alleges that the defendants acted in bad faith by agreeing to a resolution and then claiming that Dickey failed to exhaust all administrative remedies, there is no evidence in the record supporting this.

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