

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-1545

A. CORWIN TAYLOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOSEPH R. FRAZER; D. KENT GILLIAM; WAYNE K. TAYLOR; DEBRA C. TAYLOR; NATHANIEL M. COLLIER, III; WILLIAM B. CAVE; PLATO GEORGE ELIADES, II; THOMAS GORDON; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; MARK L. EARLEY; RANDOLPH A. BEALES; JUDITH W. JAGDMANN; GREGORY E. LUCYK, SR.; PETER R. MESSITT; VIRGINIA STATE BAR; MARY MARTILINO; EDWARD L. DAVIS; R. CRAIG HOPSON; WILLIAM S. FRANCIS; MELISSA HOY; D.T.T. INCORPORATED; WILLIAM R. SHELTON, Judge,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior District Judge. (CA-01-680-3)

Submitted: August 15, 2002

Decided: August 19, 2002

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

A. Corwin Taylor, Appellant Pro Se. Nathaniel Macon Collier, III, Colonial Heights, Virginia; Hugh McCoy Fain, III, Mary Elizabeth Davis, SPOTTS, FAIN, CHAPPELL & ANDERSON, Richmond, Virginia; Jeffrey Hamilton Geiger, SANDS, ANDERSON, MARKS & MILLER, Richmond, Virginia; Plato George Eliades, II, HILL, RAINEY & ELIADES, Hopewell, Virginia; Thomas Gordon, GORDON, DODSON & GORDON, Chesterfield, Virginia; Peter Robert Messitt, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; William S. Francis, Jr., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

A. Corwin Taylor appeals the district court's orders adopting the two reports and recommendation of the magistrate judge and finally dismissing this civil action. 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 Taylor v. Frazer, No. CA-01-680-3 (E.D. Va. Feb. 25, 2002, May 8, 2002). We dispense with oral argument and deny Taylor's pending motion for the appointment of counsel because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED