

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6599

BENNIE A. MACK, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CARL FOX, In his individual capacity and in his former official capacity as District Attorney; JAMES WOODALL, In his individual capacity and in his official capacity as District Attorney for the 15B Prosecutorial district of NC; WADE BARBER, Retired Superior Court Judge in his individual capacity; ARIES COX, In his individual capacity and in his official capacity as a probation officer for the 15B Prosecutorial District of NC; GEOFFREY HATHWAY, In his individual capacity and in his official capacity as supervisor for the department of probation and parole for the 15B Prosecutorial District of NC; VIN LINGA, In her individual capacity and in her former official capacity as Assistant District Attorney for the NC 15B Prosecutorial District; ROY COOPER, In his individual capacity and in his official capacity as Attorney General for the State of NC; CLARENCE JOE DELFORGE, III; ORANGE COUNTY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Senior District Judge. (1:07-cv-00784-NCT-DPD)

Submitted: June 18, 2009

Decided: June 25, 2009

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bennie A. Mack, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Gerald Patrick Murphy, Yvonne Bulluck Ricci, Assistant Attorney Generals, Raleigh, North Carolina; Grady L. Balentine, Jr., Special Deputy Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bennie A. Mack, Jr., appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Mack v. Fox, No. 1:07-cv-00784-NCT-DPD (M.D.N.C. Mar. 26, 2009). 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