

Filed: October 3, 2002

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-6182
(CA-99-431-7)

Jerome Clark,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

John D. Oakes, etc., et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

O R D E R

The court amends its opinion filed September 23, 2002, as follows:

On page 2, section 1 -- counsel for appellees is corrected to read "William Michael Hackworth, City Attorney, William X. Parsons, Assistant City Attorney, Elizabeth Kay Dillon, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees."

On page 3, footnote * -- the references to "Oakes" are corrected to read "Clark."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor

Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-6182

JEROME CLARK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN D. OAKES, Roanoke City Police Officer;
JOHN DOE 1, Roanoke City Police Officer; JOHN
DOE 2, Roanoke City Police Officer; JOHN DOE
3, Roanoke City Police Officer; JANE DOE 1,
Nurse, Roanoke City Jail,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ROANOKE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge.
(CA-00-431-7)

Submitted: August 27, 2002

Decided: September 23, 2002

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerome Clark, Appellant Pro Se. William Michael Hackworth, City Attorney, William X. Parsons, Assistant City Attorney, Elizabeth Kay Dillon, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jerome Clark appeals a jury verdict in his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2002) action against Roanoke City police officer John D. Oakes and other unnamed police officers.* This court may reverse a jury verdict only when there is a complete absence of probative facts to support the conclusions reached by the jury. Sherrill White Constr., Inc. v. S.C. Nat'l Bank, 713 F.2d 1047, 1050 (4th Cir. 1983). We find probative facts to support the conclusions reached by the jury. Accordingly, we affirm the jury's verdict. We deny Clark's motion "to serve Officers Oakes and Hurley with perjury charges" and his motion to authorize preparation of transcript at government expense. 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

* On appeal, Clark does not contest the district court's dismissal of the other defendants from this action. With respect to the unnamed officers, despite warning by the district court that failure to amend the complaint with the identities of these officers would result in dismissal against the unnamed officers, Clark failed to do so.