

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-7522**

---

GUY CARMICHAEL CRENSHAW,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, Unknown and unnamed John and Jane Doe Attorneys and Officers; CUMBERLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT, Unknown and unnamed John and Jane Doe Sheriff's Officers; CUMBERLAND COUNTY, and Federal Drug Enforcement Team, unknown and unnamed John and Jane Doe Agents; STEVEN D. GOODWIN; DOUGLAS P. MCGEE; SA'AD EL-AMIN; JAMES S. GILMORE, III, Governor; BUCKINGHAM COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; FARMVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT; CLAUDE MEINHART; RODNEY DAVENPORT; TRAVIS GILLIAM; TODD PHILLIPS; DENNIS OWNBY, Cumberland County Sheriff's Office; PATRICIA SALES, Commonwealth Attorney; JANET RENO, Department of Justice; EDGAR M. WRIGHT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge. (CA-00-719-7)

---

Submitted: May 17, 2001

Decided: May 22, 2001

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Guy Carmichael Crenshaw, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Guy Carmichael Crenshaw appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) complaint. 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. Crenshaw v. Virginia, No. CA-00-719-7 (W.D. Va. Sept. 15, 2000). We deny Crenshaw's 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