

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 07-1720

---

WILLIAM C. BOND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KENNETH BLUM, SR.; DUDLEY F.B. HODGSON; WILLIAM SLAVIN;  
MCDANIEL, BENNETT & GRIFFIN; ADELBERG, RUDOW, DORF & HENDLER,  
LLC; CHRISTOPHER W. NICHOLSON; KENNETH BLUM, JR.,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MERRILL LYNCH & CO; MERCANTILE BANKSHARES CORPORATION; BANK OF  
AMERICA; LAW OFFICES OF TIMOTHY M. GUNNING; HOWARD J.  
SCHULMAN; SCHULMAN & KAUFMAN, LLC; THOMAS & LIBOWITZ, PA;  
MICHAEL S. LIBOWITZ; LAW OFFICES OF RICHARD M. KARCESKI;  
RICHARD M. KARCESKI; BANK OF AMERICA, NA; BANK OF AMERICA  
CORPORATION,

Garnishees,

v.

ALYSON BOND, Co-Movant to release writ of garnishment;  
SCHULMAN & KAUFMAN, LLC; HOWARD J. SCHULMAN,

Movants.

---

No. 08-1171

---

WILLIAM C. BOND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KENNETH BLUM, SR.; ERLENE BLUM; ALAN S. COHN; ROBIN COHN;  
KENNETH BLUM, JR.; DUDLEY F.B. HODGSON; WILLIAM H. SLAVIN;  
WILLIAM A. MCDANIEL, JR.; CAROLINE A. GRIFFIN; MCDANIEL,  
BENNETT & GRIFFIN; MCDANIEL & GRIFFIN; PAUL A. DORF; ADELBERG,  
RUDOW, DORF & HENDLER, LLC; GERARD P. MARTIN; MIRIAM PESSIN;  
RENT-A-WRECK OF AMERICA, INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, Senior District Judge;  
J. Frederick Motz, District Judge. (1:01-cv-02600-MJG; 1:07-cv-  
01385-JFM)

---

Submitted: August 27, 2008

Decided: September 19, 2008

---

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William C. Bond, Appellant Pro Se. Amy E. Askew, William Fitts  
Ryan, Jr., WHITEFORD, TAYLOR & PRESTON, LLP, Baltimore, Maryland;  
Gerard Patrick Martin, Thy Christine Pham, ROSENBERG, MARTIN &  
GREENBERG, LLP, Baltimore, Maryland; Kathryn Miller Goldman,  
JIRANEK, GOLDMAN & MINTON, LLC, Baltimore, Maryland; Jo C. Bennett,  
William Alden McDaniel, Jr., MCDANIEL, BENNETT & GRIFFIN,  
Baltimore, Maryland; Andrew Radding, Michael Richard Severino,  
ADELBERG, RUDOW, DORF & HENDLER, LLC, Baltimore, Maryland, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William C. Bond appeals the district court's rulings dismissing his dual actions filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). In Case No. 07-1720, Bond appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for reconsideration of the judgment in his underlying copyright action.<sup>1</sup> This court reviews the denial of a Rule 60(b) motion for an abuse of discretion. See MLC Automotive, LLC v. Town of Southern Pines, 532 F.3d 269, 277 (4th Cir. 2008). We have reviewed the record and conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion for reconsideration.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Bond v. Blum, No. 1:01-cv-02600-MJG (D. Md. July 12, 2007).

In Case No. 08-1171, Bond appeals from the district court's sua sponte dismissal of his "independent action" under Rule 60(b), in which Bond sought monetary damages for violations of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C.A. §§ 1961-1968 (West 2000 & Supp. 2008), and other federal statutes. We have reviewed the record and find that the district court did

---

<sup>1</sup>See Bond v. Blum, 317 F.3d 385 (4th Cir. 2003).

<sup>2</sup>Bond also appeals from the district court's denial of a number of other post-judgment motions that were filed in this case, including a motion to recuse the presiding judge. Upon review of the record, we find there were no valid grounds for recusal and that the district court did not err in denying Bond's post-judgment motions.

not err in dismissing Bond's action. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Bond v. Blum, No. 1:07-cv-01385-JFM (D. Md. June 26, 2007).

While we grant Bond's motion to supplement his informal brief in Case No. 07-1720, we deny all other pending motions. 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.

AFFIRMED