

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1705

EDDIE BRADFORD LEE; WILLIAM SANFORD GADD;
KATHY CAROL MOORE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

GRAHAM C. MULLEN; ROBERT D. POTTER; RICHARD L.
VOORHEES; H. BRENT MCKNIGHT; CARL HORN, III;
J. HARVIE WILKINSON, III; DONALD S. RUSSELL,
JR.; H. EMORY WIDENER, JR.; K. HALL; FRANCIS
D. MURNAGHAN, JR.; SAM J. ERVIN, III; WILLIAM
WILKINS, JR.; PAUL V. NIEMEYER; CLYDE H.
HAMILTON; J. MICHAEL LUTTIG; KAREN J.
WILLIAMS; M. BLANE MICHAEL; DIANA GRIBBON
MOTZ; JOHN D. BUTZNER; J. DICKSON PHILLIPS;
ROBERT F. CHAPMAN; MARK T. CALLOWAY; JAMES M.
SULLIVAN; CLIFFORD C. MARSHALL; LORETTA C.
ARGRETT; JONATHAN S. COHEN; DONALD B. TOBIN;
ELLEN M. GREGG; SEVERAL UNKNOWN STAFF
ATTORNEYS; UNKNOWN OFFICERS OF THE COURT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western Dis-
trict of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Lacy H. Thornburg, District
Judge. (CA-99-180-T-3)

Submitted: October 17, 2000

Decided: November 1, 2000

Before TRAXLER and KING, Circuit Judges.*

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eddie Bradford Lee, William Sanford Gadd, Kathy Carol Moore, Appellants Pro Se. Joseph L. Brinkley, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina; Gilbert Steven Rothenberg, John A. Dudeck, Jr., UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.; Frank Lane Williamson, Debbie Weston Harden, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

* The opinion is filed by a quorum pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d) 1994).

PER CURIAM:

Eddie Bradford Lee, William Sanford Gadd, and Kathy Carol Moore appeal the district court's order dismissing their civil complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. 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. See Lee v. Mullen, No. CA-99-180-T-3 (W.D.N.C. Sept. 3, 1999). 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