

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-1921**

---

MARIE THERESE ASSA'AD-FALTAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, The; ALAN WILSON, Attorney General;  
WARDEN, Alvin S. Glenn Detention Center; COLUMBIA, THE CITY OF, South  
Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 22-6993**

---

MARIE THERESE ASSA'AD-FALTAS, MD, MPH,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; COLUMBIA SOUTH CAROLINA, CITY OF,  
hereinafter "the City,"

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 22-6994**

---

MARIE THERESE ASSA'AD-FALTAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; COLUMBIA SOUTH CAROLINA, CITY OF,  
hereinafter "the City,"

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 22-6995**

---

MARIE THERESE ASS'AD-FALTAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; CITY OF COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

**No. 22-6998**

---

MARIE THERESE ASSA'AD-FALTAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; CITY OF COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (3:11-cv-00809-TLW; 1:15-cv-00047-TLW; 1:15-cv-00044-TLW; 1:12-cv-02294-TLW; 1:12-cv-02228-TLW)

---

Submitted: March 21, 2023

Decided: March 23, 2023

---

Before WYNN and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Marie Therese Assa'ad-Faltas, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated cases, Marie Therese Assa'ad-Faltas appeals the district court's orders denying her motions to reopen the respective underlying district court actions, as well as the court's orders denying her subsequently filed Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motions. We have reviewed the records in the underlying federal actions and discern no error. *See, e.g., Robinson v. Wix Filtration Corp. LLC*, 599 F.3d 403, 411 (4th Cir. 2010) (explaining that granting a Rule 59(e) motion is "discretionary" and "need not be granted unless the district court finds that there has been an intervening change of controlling law, that new evidence has become available, or that there is a need to correct a clear error or prevent manifest injustice"). We thus affirm the district court's orders. *See Assa'ad-Faltas v. South Carolina*, No. 3:11-cv-00809-TLW (D.S.C. Dec. 6, 2021 & July 28, 2022); *Assa'ad-Faltas v. South Carolina*, No. 1:15-cv-00047-TLW (D.S.C. Dec. 6, 2021 & July 28, 2022); *Assa'ad-Faltas v. South Carolina*, No. 1:15-cv-00044-TLW (D.S.C. Dec. 6, 2021 & July 28, 2022); *Assa'ad-Faltas v. South Carolina*, No. 1:12-cv-02294-TLW (D.S.C. Dec. 6, 2021 & July 28, 2022); *Assa'ad-Faltas v. South Carolina*, No. 1:12-cv-02228-TLW (D.S.C. Dec. 6, 2021 & July 28, 2022).

We deny the pending motions to appoint counsel or argue the appeals pro se, and deny as moot the motions to disqualify. 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*