UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6696

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, a/k/a Allah-God Kundalini Isa Allah, and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HARRELL WATTS, Administrator, National Inmate Appeals, Federal BOP; HARLEY G. LAPPIN, Director, Federal BOP; KIMBERLEY WHITE, Regional Administrator, Inmate Appeals, Federal BOP, Mid-Atlantic Region; VANESSA P. ADAMS, Warden, Petersburg FCC, Federal BOP; JESUS M. HUERTAS, Supervisory Chaplain, Petersburg FCC, Federal BOP; MRS. BROWDER, Accoc. Chaplain, FCC Petersburg [medium] Federal BOP,

Defendants – Appellees.

No. 09-7180

WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, a/k/a Allah-God Kundalini Isa Allah, and others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HARRELL WATTS, Administrator, National Inmate Appeals, Federal BOP; HARLEY G. LAPPIN, Director, Federal BOP; KIMBERLEY WHITE, Regional Administrator, Inmate Appeals, Federal BOP, Mid-Atlantic Region; VANESSA P. ADAMS, Warden, Petersburg FCC, Federal BOP; JESUS M. HUERTAS, Supervisory Chaplain, Petersburg FCC, Federal BOP; MRS. BROWDER, Accoc. Chaplain, FCC Petersburg [medium] Federal BOP,

Defendants – Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, Senior District Judge. (1:06-cv-01061-TSE-TCB)

Submitted: September 24, 2009 Decided: November 4, 2009

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Henry Harrison, Appellant Pro Se. Monika L. Moore, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Harrison appeals the district court's order granting the Defendants' motion to dismiss Harrison's complaint pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), and denying reconsideration of that order. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the court's order granting the Defendants' motion to dismiss for the reasons stated by the district court. With respect to the district court's order denying reconsideration of that order, Harrison has forfeited appellate review of that order pursuant to 4th Cir. R. 34(b) and we therefore affirm that order. Harrison v. Watts, No. 1:06-cv-01061-TSE-TCB (E.D. Va. Mar. 26 & June 9, 2009). We also deny Harrison's motion to schedule oral argument as 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