

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-2231

JERRY ADAMS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CHRIS JONES, Delegate, in his Official Capacity as Mayor for the City of Suffolk, Virginia; CITY OF SUFFOLK, VIRGINIA; W. FREEMAN, in his Official Capacity as Chief of Police for the City of Suffolk, Virginia; CHIEF OF POLICE ONE, in his Official Capacity as Chief of Police for the City of Suffolk, Virginia; C. PHILLIPS FERGUSON, in his Official Capacity as Commonwealth Attorney for the City of Suffolk, Virginia; DAVE MCALLISTER, in his Official Capacity as Head of Virginia State Crash Team; CAPTAIN ONE, in his Official Capacity as Captain of the Suffolk Police Department; RODHAM T. DELK, JR., Judge, in his Official Capacity as Judge for the Circuit Court of Suffolk, Virginia; CITY MANAGER ONE, in his Official Capacity as City Manager of the City of Suffolk, Virginia,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SERGEANT ONE, in his Official Capacity as a Virginia State Policeman,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, District Judge. (CA-05-434-2)

Submitted: February 17, 2006

Decided: March 14, 2006

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerry Adams, Appellant Pro Se. Anthony Charles Williams, OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY, Suffolk, Virginia; Christopher Ambrosio, Lisa Lieberman Thatch, VANDEVENTER BLACK, L.L.P., Norfolk, Virginia; Stephen Michael Hall, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jerry Adams appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Adams v. Jones, No. CA-05-434-2 (E.D. Va. Oct. 27, 2005; Nov. 1, 2005). We deny the motions for summary reversal, for discovery, and for sanctions. We also deny the motion for 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