

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-1604

ROY L. PERRY-BEY, and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

PHILLIP WEBSTER, and all others similarly situated; GEORGE BOWE, and all others similarly situated; ANTHONY HAROLD; ROBERT LEE SIMPSON, and all others similarly situated; VIVIAN A. ANDERSON; MARY E. HILL, and all others similarly situated; CORNELL MORRIS, and all others similarly situated; ESPER L. HURDLE, JR., and all others similarly situated; EARNEST W. GIBBS, and all others similarly situated; WALTER WATSON, and all others similarly situated; JOHN G. TAYLOR; LAWRENCE TAYLOR, and all others similarly situated; DANIEL DELOACH, and all others similarly situated; WILLIAM T. HAYES; RORY T. JENKINS, and all others similarly situated; KRYSTAL D. JONES, and all others similarly situated; CHRISTOPHER L. THOMPSON, and all others similarly situated; ANTHONY W. ELLIOTT, and all others similarly situated; NEAL C. MORRISON, and all others similarly situated; RONALD M. GREEN, as Special Representative of the Estate of Wendell Alonzo Willis, deceased,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOHN E. WHITLEY; THOMAS B. MODLY, in his official capacity as Acting Secretary of the Navy; DENIS R. MCDONOUGH; JOHN P. ROTH; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE; LLOYD AUSTIN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (2:19-cv-00344-RAJ-DEM)

Submitted: December 2, 2021

Decided: January 5, 2022

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, AGEE, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Roy L. Perry-Bey, Appellant Pro Se. Garry Daniel Hartlieb, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Roy L. Perry-Bey appeals the district court's order administratively closing this case, terminating all pending motions, and ordering that new actions be opened for each individual plaintiff who filed a third amended complaint.* We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Perry-Bey v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, No. 2:19-cv-00344-RAJ-DEM (E.D. Va. May 13, 2021). We deny Perry-Bey's motion for appointment of counsel. 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

* Perry-Bey's third amended complaint is currently pending in *Perry-Bey v. U.S. Dep't of Defense*, No. 2:21-cv-00268-RAJ-DEM.