

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-6234

STEVEN A. SILVERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 96-1347

STEVEN A. SILVERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GREGORY WELSH, Assistant United States Attorney; ANDREW G. W. NORMAN, Assistant United States Attorney; ALEXANDER F. SMITH; Special Agent - DEA; LARRY FORLETTA, Special Agent - DEA; JOHN ROBINSON, Special Agent - DEA; ROBERT J. BETKEY, Special Agent - IRS; STAN YOUNG, Special Agent - IRS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 96-1543

STEVEN A. SILVERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GREGORY WELSH, Assistant United States Attorney; ANDREW G. W. NORMAN, Assistant United States Attorney; ALEXANDER F. SMITH, Special Agent - DEA; LARRY FORLETTA, Special Agent - DEA; JOHN ROBINSON, Special Agent - DEA; ROBERT J. BETKEY, Special Agent - IRS; STAN YOUNG, Special Agent - IRS,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 96-6587

STEVEN A. SILVERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; GREGORY WELSH, Assistant United States Attorney; ANDREW G. W. NORMAN, Assistant United States Attorney; ALEXANDER F. SMITH, Special Agent - Drug Enforcement Agency; LARRY FORLETTA, Special Agent - Drug Enforcement Agency; JOHN ROBINSON, Special Agent - Drug Enforcement Agency; ROBERT J. BETKEY, Special Agent - Internal Revenue Service; STAN YOUNG, Special Agent - Internal Revenue Service,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Herbert N. Maletz, Senior Judge, sitting by designation. (CA-94-3502-HNM, CA-93-2634-HNM)

Submitted: July 23, 1996

Decided: July 31, 1996

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Steven A. Silvers, Appellant Pro Se. Roann Nichols, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's order denying relief on his Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), action (No. 96-1543), and his action brought pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b) (1988); 28 U.S.C.A. § 2401(b) (West 1994); 28 U.S.C.A. §§ 2671-2680 (West 1994) (No. 96-6587). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Silvers v. Welsh, Silvers v. United States, Nos. CA-93-2634-HNM; CA-94-3502-HNM (D. Md. Apr. 1, 1996).

In addition, Appellant appeals from the district court's orders denying his motions for disqualification and/or recusal (Nos. 96-6234; 96-1347).^{*} We find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motions. See In re Beard, 811 F.2d 818, 827 (4th Cir. 1987); United States v. Parker, 742 F.2d 127, 128 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 1076 (1984). 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

^{*} This court has jurisdiction over these appeals pursuant to the doctrine of cumulative finality. See Equipment Fin. Gp., Inc. v. Traverse Computer Brokers, 973 F.2d 345, 347 (4th Cir. 1992).