

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1697

EDWARD F. HODGES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NORMAN HUDSON, Chief, South Hill Police Department; EARL HORNE, Mayor, Town of South Hill; BILL ELKINS, Attorney at Law; TOWN OF SOUTH HILL; MILLIE BRACEY, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council members; JOHNNIE COOK, Member of the town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member; WILLIAM DOYLE, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member; JIMMIE BUTTS, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member; WILLIAM GREGORY, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member; WOODROW KIDD, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member; JOHNNIE CROWDER, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member; LEROY SASSER, Member of the Town Council, individually and in their capacity as council member,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CA-01-74)

Submitted: September 20, 2001

Decided: September 26, 2001

Before LUTTIG, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Edward P. Hodges, Appellant Pro Se. Barrett Erskine Pope, Amy Jacqueline Inge, DURRETTE, IRVIN & BRADSHAW, P.L.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Edward F. Hodges appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2001) complaint and denying his motion for reconsideration. 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. Hodges v. Hudson, No. CA-01-74 (E.D. Va. Apr. 4 & 20, 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