

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-2242**

---

FREDERICK LEWIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JEFFERY L. NEWTON, CJM; WALTER J. MINTON; JOAN LAFLAND;  
PAULA MCKENZIE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, Senior  
District Judge. (3:14-cv-00431-JRS)

---

Submitted: July 31, 2015

Decided: September 24, 2015

---

Before NIEMEYER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mark J. Krudys, THE KRUDYS LAW FIRM, PLC, Richmond, Virginia,  
for Appellant. Carlene Booth Johnson, PERRY LAW FIRM, Dillwyn,  
Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Frederick Lewis filed a civil action against various officials and staff at Riverside Regional Jail in Prince George County, Virginia, alleging claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) for Eighth Amendment and due process violations, as well as a Virginia state law claim for false imprisonment. The district court granted Defendants' motion to dismiss the action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), finding that Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity and that Lewis' claims otherwise failed as a matter of law.

On appeal, Lewis challenges the court's consideration of records appended to the motion to dismiss. A district court is required to consider documents incorporated into the complaint, Cozzarelli v. Inspire Pharms. Inc., 549 F.3d 618, 625 (4th Cir. 2008), and documents attached to a motion to dismiss that are integral to and relied on in the complaint, Zak v. Chelsea Therapeutics Int'l, Ltd., 780 F.3d 597, 606-07 (4th Cir. 2015). In addition, a court may take judicial notice of matters of public record in considering a motion to dismiss. Sec'y of State for Defence v. Trimble Navigation Ltd., 484 F.3d 700, 705 (4th Cir. 2007). Therefore, the district court did not err in considering the documents provided by the parties.

Our review of the record also confirms that, in declining to release Lewis earlier, Defendants acted reasonably, as a

matter of law, in response to the ambiguous and changing information provided by the state courts. We therefore conclude that the district court appropriately dismissed Lewis' action.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED