

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1820

JAMES C. POWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF NORFOLK, a Municipal Corporation; City of Norfolk Police Department, a Division thereof; HAROLD P. JUREN, individually and in his official capacity as Deputy City Attorney for the City of Norfolk; HENRY P. HENSON, individually and in his official capacity as Police Chief of the City of Norfolk; CURTIS TODD, JR., individually and in his official capacity as Lieutenant of the Police Department of the City of Norfolk; JAMES BROWNLIE, individually and in his official capacity as Sergeant of the Police Department for the City of Norfolk; CITY OF NORFOLK POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF NORFOLK ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; CITY OF NORFOLK COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, a division thereof,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JOHNNY E. MORRISON, individually and in his official capacity as Commonwealth Attorney for the City of Portsmouth; WILLIAM F. RUTHERFORD, individually and in his official capacity as Commonwealth Attorney for the City of Norfolk; CITY OF PORTSMOUTH, a municipal corporation; CITY OF PORTSMOUTH COMMONWEALTH ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, a division thereof,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Henry C. Morgan, Jr., District Judge. (CA-99-2114-2)

Submitted: September 21, 2000 Decided: September 27, 2000

Before WILKINS, NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James C. Powell, Appellant Pro Se. Rebecca McFerren King, John Yulee Richardson, Jr., CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James C. Powell appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) complaint and denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Powell v. City of Norfolk, No. CA-99-2114-2 (E.D. Va. May 23, 2000, June 2, 2000 & July 19, 2000). 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