

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 20-6279

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JEREMY MICHAEL MONTGOMERY, a/k/a Mike,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:15-cr-00468-CCB-3)

Submitted: May 19, 2020

Decided: May 22, 2020

Before NIEMEYER, HARRIS, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeremy Michael Montgomery, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeremy Michael Montgomery, a federal inmate who was convicted of possession of a firearm in furtherance of a drug trafficking crime and aiding and abetting in 2016, appeals the district court's order construing his motion requesting copies of the docket in his criminal case, his plea agreement, the judgment and commitment order, the statement of reasons for sentence, the indictment, and the transcript of his guilty plea hearing as a motion for copy work at government expense and granting the motion in part and denying it in part. The district court provided to Montgomery's custodian copies of the docket and the judgment and commitment order issued in Montgomery's case and denied the remainder of the motion.

Copies of transcripts and court records may be provided to an indigent litigant at government expense upon a showing by the litigant of a particularized need for the documents. *See Jones v. Superintendent, Va. State Farm*, 460 F.2d 150, 152-53 (4th Cir. 1972). Such a litigant, however, is not entitled to free copies "merely to comb the record in the hope of discovering some flaw." *United States v. Glass*, 317 F.2d 200, 202 (4th Cir. 1963).

We find no reversible error by the district court. Montgomery has not established the requisite need under *Jones* for copies of the plea agreement, statement of reasons for sentence, indictment, and hearing transcript and has not challenged the propriety of the district court's decision to provide copies of the docket and judgment and commitment order to his custodian. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's 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