

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1052

CARL ANTHONY GRAY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS CITY OF NORFOLK; PAUL R.
RIDDICK; DAUN S. HESTER; WILLIE PONDS; KEELA
BOOSE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge.
(CA-00-825-2)

Submitted: May 31, 2001

Decided: June 6, 2001

Before WILKINS, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carl Anthony Gray, Appellant Pro Se. M. Wayne Ringer, Daniel R.
Hagemeister, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Norfolk, Virginia, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Carl A. Gray appeals from the district court's order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss Gray's civil complaint originally filed in state court and removed by Defendants to the district court and denying Gray's motions for remand, for sanctions, and to amend the complaint. We have reviewed the record, the district court's order, the transcripts of the hearings held on December 13, 2000, and January 4, 2001, at which the district court stated from the bench its reasons for denying relief, and Gray's informal brief filed in this court. We find no reversible error in the court's denial of Gray's motions to remand, to amend, and to impose sanctions. With regard to the motion to dismiss, Gray has not preserved any issue for our review because he failed to challenge the bases for the district court's ruling on that motion. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Gray v. Board of Supervisors, No. CA-00-825-2 (E.D. Va. Dec. 13, 2000 & Jan. 4, 2001). 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