

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-7818

WARREN CHASE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

PHLONDA PEAY; JACK KAVANAGH, Warden; DAVID MCKOY, (C.O. #2); ERIC THOMPSON; RONALD TOLBERT; ENESS BROWN, Lieutenant; VANESSA WILLIS, Sgt. Ms.; KEITH HARRIS, Correctional Officer #2 Mr.; BERNARD JONES, Lieutenant Mr.; FRANK DELBRIDGE, Correctional Officer #2, Mr.; BENSON BELL, Correctional Officer #1, Mr.; SAMUEL LEE, Major; NICOLE KNOX, Correctional Officer #2, Ms.; DENISE WHITE, Sergeant; DAVID ROANE, Correctional Officer #2, Mr.; ERIC NELSON, Sergeant; CHARLES GRAHAM, Captain; THOMAS CARTER, Sergeant Mr.; RODNEY BYRD, Correctional Officer #2, Mr.; DARYL ROBINSON, Correctional Officer #2, Mr.; ERNEST POTEE, Correctional Officer #2, Mr.; AMAHL FOSTER, Correctional Officer #1, Mr.; DEBORAH SHIFFLETT, Correctional Officer #2, Ms.; GEORGE BRAXTON, Correctional Officer #1, Mr.; VINCENT MOORE, Correctional Officer #2, Mr.; JEHU RAGINS, Mr., (C.O. #2),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CA-98-2367-CCB-1)

Submitted: May 14, 2004

Decided: June 2, 2004

Before WILKINSON and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James E. Weaver, VENABLE, BAETJER & HOWARD, L.L.P., Baltimore, Maryland; Joseph B. Tetrault, PRISONER RIGHTS INFORMATION SYSTEM, Chestertown, Maryland, for Appellant. J. Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General of Maryland, David P. Kennedy, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Warren Chase appeals a district court order granting the Defendants' motion for summary judgment and dismissing his amended 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court opinion and find no error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Chase v. Peay, 286 F. Supp. 2d 523 (D. Md. 2003). 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