UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-6267

EARL D. JOHNSON; RAYMOND "TONY" RIVENBARK; FREDERICK KNOBLOCH; TRACY K. JACKSON; DANTES AUGUSTIN; ELMO DALTON; COY FOUST; DAVID CARGILE; STEVE ROLLINS; WAYNE LAWSON; MATTHEW SONNER; KEVIN HATTEN; LARRY DOTSON; ROBERT E. LEE JONES, JR.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

JOHN RICHMOND; DAVID FAIRFAX; JAMES SHORTRIDGE; JOHN BREDEAUX; CHRISTOPHER BROWN; JOSEPH R. BEESLEY; HURLEY WEBB; JAMES L. COMBS; CHRISTOPHER S. HUDSON; ANTHONY L. BERNARD; DWAYNE BAILEY; ROBERT J. KOPACZEWSKI; DAVID STRAWMYER; MARK HART; DARRYL WHEATON; R. CARMICHAEL, JR.; PHILIP EASLEY; JAMES KILGORE; WILLIAM CADLE; BOBBY MUSE; STEVE CROCKETT; RICHARD BOWLES; CARL FITZGERALD; KENNETH BOWMAN; ANTONIO THOMAS; COOLIDGE ELLIS; ROGER ALLISON; JOHN BIGGS,

Plaintiffs,

versus

MCI WORLDCOM COMMUNICATIONS, INCORPORATED, a/k/a MCI Communications, Incorporated, a/k/a MCI Telecommunications, Incorporated, a Delaware Corporation, James C. Brincefield, Jr., Esquire, Registered Agent; MCI WORLDCOM COMMUNICATIONS OF VIRGINIA, INCORPORATED, a/k/a MCI Communications, Incorporated, a/k/a MCI Telecommunications, Incorporated, James C. Brincefield, Jr., Registered Agent; MCI WORLDCOM NETWORK SERVICES, INCORPORATED, a/k/a MCI Telecommunications, Incorporated, a/k/a

MCI Communications, Incorporated, Beverly L. Crump, Registered Agent; MCI WORLDCOM NETWORK SERVICES OF VIRGINIA, INCORPORATED, a/k/a MCI Communications, Incorporated, a/k/a MCI Telecommunications, Incorporated, Beverly L. Crump, Registered Agent; T-NETIX TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, INCORPORATED, a/k/a Gateway Technologies, Incorporated, a Texas Corporation, Commonwealth Legal Services, Incorporated, Registered Agent; VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Inmate Telephone Systems aka Inmate Telephone Services; RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director, Virginia Department of Corrections, Inmate Telephone Systems/Services; HOWARD W. MURRAY, Inmate Telephone Systems; EDWARD C. MORRIS, Inmate Telephone Systems and Inmate Telephone Services; STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior District Judge. (CA-00-968-7)

Submitted: July 10, 2002 Decided: July 24, 2002

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Earl D. Johnson, Raymond Rivenbark, Frederick Knobloch, Tracy K. Jackson, Dantes Augustin, Elmo Dalton, Coy Foust, David Cargile, Steve Rollins, Wayne Lawson, Matthew Sonner, Kevin Hatten, Larry Dotson, Robert E. Lee Jones, Jr., Appellants Pro Se. David Gant Shuford, Thomas Andrew Coulter, LECLAIR RYAN, P.C., Richmond, Virginia; Stephanie Ann Joyce, KELLEY, DRYE & WARREN, L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; Glenn B. Manishin, KELLEY, DRYE & WARREN, L.L.P., Vienna, Virginia; Mark Ralph Davis, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Philip R. deHaas, STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's orders dismissing their civil complaint and denying Appellant Robert E. Lee Jones' motions for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's order denying class action certification and the district court's adverse grant of summary judgment. They further appeal the district court's earlier orders relating to the proper party plaintiffs. We have reviewed the record, Appellants' numerous claims on appeal, and the district court's opinions, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Jones v. MCI Worldcom Communications, Incorporated, No. CA-00-968-7 (W.D. Va. Dec. 15, 2000; Nov. 23 & 29, 2001; Jan. 11, 2002). To the extent Appellants seek to raise claims not properly before the district court for consideration, we decline to review such claims. 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