

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-1014

CLINTON C. BARLOW,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, and the City of Norfolk under the state authority of the Honorable Governor Mark R. Warner, and c/o the Virginia Workers Compensation Commission, Chairman Lawrence D. Tarr and J.J. Szablewicz, and Carolyn L. Fleming, V.W.C. claims examiner; EDMUND F. KELLY, Head CEO President of The Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company; ROBERT A. RAPAPORT, Esquire; RUSSELL N. BRAHM, III, Esquire; DANIEL E. ROSNER, Esquire; WINKELMAN INC, President Corporation and Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Company c/o The Law Firm of Clarke, Dolph, Rapaport, Hardy & Hull, P.L.C.; STATE OF VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES, Division of C.D.L. and M.V. licenses . . . Driver's name: William Clark Terry, driver of and international dump truck; NAVISTAR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION, B/K/A the International Harvester Corporation, CEO President, Daniel C. Ustian; TEAMSTERS UNION INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF AMERICA, President, James P. Hoff, Jr.

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (CA-04-734-2)

Submitted: March 24, 2005

Decided: March 31, 2005

Before WIDENER and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clinton C. Barlow, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Clinton C. Barlow appeals the district court's orders denying his motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and his subsequent motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss on the reasoning of the district court. See Barlow v. Virginia, No. CA-04-734-2 (E.D. Va. Dec. 9, 2004; Feb. 16, 2005). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED