

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 02-6367

---

MARK CORRIGAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MS. ATKINS; MS. BOLLOT; DR. CERVIE; PITT  
COUNTY; WILSON COUNTY; SERGEANT BAILEY;  
OFFICER BARNES; HOWARD ADAMS; DIANA CARMACK;  
KATHARINA DEWALD,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior  
District Judge. (CA-98-667-5-CT)

---

Submitted: July 9, 2002

Decided: August 22, 2002

---

Before WILKINS, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mark Corrigan, Appellant Pro Se. JoAnne Keeler Burgdorff, PITT COUNTY LEGAL DEPARTMENT, Greenville, North Carolina; Tommy Willis Jarrett, DEES, SMITH, POWELL, JARRETT, DEES & JONES, Goldsboro, North Carolina; Deanna Davis Anderson, John Dale Madden, SMITH, ANDERSON, BLOUNT, DORSETT, MITCHELL & JERNIGAN, Raleigh, North Carolina; G. Christopher Olson, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Edwin Constant Bryson, Jr., PATTERSON, DILTHEY, CLAY & BRYSON, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mark Corrigan appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2001) complaint,\* denying his motions for reconsideration, and denying his motion to amend the complaint and to retain an expert witness. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny § 1983 relief and find no reversible error. Nor do we find any error in the district court's denial of Corrigan's motions for reconsideration, to amend the complaint, and to retain an expert witness. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Corrigan v. Atkins, No. CA-98-667-5-CT (E.D.N.C. Dec. 28, 1998; Feb. 23, 1999; Feb. 24, 2000; Sept. 27, 2000; Oct. 24, 2000; Feb. 12, 2002). 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

---

\* Corrigan is a federal inmate. Thus, his action is more appropriately construed as one under Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).