## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

|  | No. 23-6969            |                               |
|--|------------------------|-------------------------------|
| ANTWYN GIBBS,  |                        |                               |
| Petitioner - A   | ppellant,              |                               |
| v.   |                        |                               |
| DONALD AMES,   |                        |                               |
| Respondent -   | Appellee.              |                               |
|  |                        |                               |
| Appeal from the United States Dist<br>Charleston. John T. Copenhaver, J. |                        | <u> </u>                      |
| Submitted: December 14, 2023   |                        | Decided: December 19, 2023    |
| Before GREGORY and RUSHING   | G, Circuit Judges, and | l MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge. |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curia  | m opinion.             |                               |
| Antwyn Gibbs, Appellant Pro Se<br>GENERAL OF WEST VIRGINIA               | •                      |                               |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind  | ing precedent in this  | circuit.                      |

## PER CURIAM:

Antwyn Gibbs appeals the district court's order denying his postjudgment motion for appointment of counsel. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Gibbs' motion for appointment of counsel on appeal and affirm the district court's order.\* *Gibbs v. Ames*, No. 2:21-cv-00577 (S.D. W. Va. Sept. 15, 2023). 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** 

<sup>\*</sup> To the extent Gibbs seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition, or the court's subsequent orders denying his other postjudgment motions, those orders are not properly before us in this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(1)(A), (4)(A).