

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1290

WILLARD R. MEADOWS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SCARLETT RATCLIFFE, Clerk of Court of Giles
County; RANDY CARGILL, Attorney; DAVID
MULLINS, Attorney; CLIFFORD JOHNSON; WILLIAM
SMITH; LEONARD STEVE SONGER; BARBARA LEE
MCGUIRE; ALBERT MCGUIRE; RANDALL DUNCAN,
Esquire, The Commonwealth Attorney; WILLIS
WOODS, The Honorable Retired Judge (Deceased),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, Chief District
Judge. (CA-99-624-R)

Submitted: April 27, 2001

Decided: May 4, 2001

Before LUTTIG and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Cir-
cuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Willard R. Meadows, Appellant Pro Se. Robert F. Rider, RIDER, THOMAS, CLEVELAND, FERRIS & EAKIN, Roanoke, Virginia; Randy Virlin Cargill, MAGEE, FOSTER, GOLDSTEIN & SAYERS, P.C., Roanoke, Virginia; David Mullins, Blacksburg, Virginia; Max Jenkins, JENKINS & QUIGLEY, Radford, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Willard Russell Meadows appeals from the district court's orders denying his two Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motions seeking reconsideration of the court's prior orders dismissing his complaint filed under 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000). We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and find no abuse of discretion. See In re Burnley, 988 F.2d 1, 3 (4th Cir. 1992). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Meadows v. Ratcliffe, No. CA-99-624-R (W.D. Va. Jan. 30 & Feb. 12, 2001). We deny the motion for 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