

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) 5:08-CV-176-BO
)
TOWN OF CARY, NC, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) 5:11-CV-31-BO
)
SCOTT L. WILKINSON,)
Defendant.)

WAKE COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) 5:12-CV-413-BO
)
WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
Defendant.)

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR. and)
(a minor) J.F.D., Suing by, her and next)
friend,)
)
Plaintiffs,)
)
v.) 5:14-CV-6-BO
)
JUDGE MONICA BOUSMAN, *et al.*,)
Defendants.)

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) 5:14-CV-46-BO
)
 WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
 Defendant.)

WAKE COUNTY NC HUMAN)
 SERVICES,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.) 5:14-CV-47-BO
)
 WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, JR.,)
)
 Defendant.)


ORDER

This matter is before the Court on motions by William Scott Davis Jr., *pro se*, to reopen these closed cases and for relief under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to appoint counsel, for appointment of a guardian ad litem under Rule 17(c)(2), and for a new trial or to alter judgment under Rule 59. Each of these cases has been dismissed, judgment has been entered, and in some cases appeals have been taken and mandate has issued. Mr. Davis' current filings, which are at best difficult to decipher, do not appear to provide the Court with any basis upon which to reopen these matters or provide Mr. Davis with relief from judgment. Moreover, a pre-filing injunction has been entered against Mr. Davis, *see Davis v. Mitchell*, 5:12-CV-493-F (E.D.N.C. March 3, 2014), and it would appear that Mr. Davis is attempting to use motion to

reopen of these cases, have counsel or a guardian appointed, or for a new trial or alter judgment as a method by which to avoid the pre-filing injunction.¹ The Court will not sanction such action.

Accordingly, the motions to reopen these closed cases and for relief under Rule 60(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to appoint counsel, for appointment of a guardian ad litem under Rule 17(c)(2), and for a new trial or to alter judgment under Rule 59 in each of the above-captioned cases are DENIED. The Court will consider critically any future filings by Mr. Davis in which it is apparent that he is merely seeking to avoid the pre-filing injunction.

SO ORDERED, this 9 day of April, 2016.


TERRENCE W. BOYLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ A pre-filing injunction has also been issued against Mr. Davis in the Eastern District of Virginia. *Davis v. Jawaorski*, No. 4:13-CV-63 (E.D.Va. November 14, 2013).