

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-7450**

---

ROBERT HOLLAND KOON, a/k/a Robert Koon, a/k/a Robert H. Koon,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LORETTA LYNCH, US Attorney General, in her official capacity as chief/judge/chief solicitor of SC; JEAN TOAL, Chief Justice, in their official capacity as chief/judge/chief solicitor of SC; ALAN WILSON, SC Attorney General, in his official capacity as chief/judge/chief solicitor of SC,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 15-7454**

---

ROBERT HOLLAND KOON, a/k/a Robert Koon, a/k/a Robert H. Koon,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

LORETTA LYNCH, US Attorney General, in her official capacity as chief/judge/chief solicitor of SC; JEAN TOAL, Chief Justice, in their official capacity as chief/judge/chief solicitor of SC; ALAN WILSON, SC Attorney General, in his official capacity as chief/judge/chief solicitor of SC,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. David C. Norton, District Judge. (4:15-cv-02107-DCN; 4:15-cv-02349-DCN)

---

Submitted: December 17, 2015                      Decided: December 22, 2015

---

Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robert Holland Koon, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these duplicative and consolidated cases, Robert Holland Koon appeals the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and dismissing without prejudice Koon's civil complaints. In No. 15-7450, Koon also appeals the district court's order denying his motions to alter or set aside the judgment. We have reviewed the records and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm in both cases for the reasons stated by the district court. Koon v. Lynch, No. 4:15-cv-02107-DCN (D.S.C. Aug. 12 & 27, 2015); Koon v. Lynch, No. 4:15-cv-02349-DCN (D.S.C. Aug. 12, 2015). 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