

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7671**

---

KEVIN SNODGRASS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

UHURU SEKOU OBATAIYE-ALLAH,

Plaintiff,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARK, Director, DOC; GERALD K. WASHINGTON, Regional Director; R. MATHENA, Warden; JOHN WALRATH, Assistant Warden; SHORTRIDGE, Operations Officer; J. GALLIHAR, Major; J. MCQUEEN, Investigator; CCS, Central Classification Services; SWINNEY, Unit Manager; KILBOURNE, Unit Manager; SERGEANT HALL, Sergeant; SERGEANT INGLE; L. T. MULLINS, Lieutenant; PAYNE, Lieutenant; J. MESSER, Grievance Coordinator; R. MULLINS, Grievance Coordinator; J. OWENS, Property; VANOVER, Property; I.H.O. L. MULLINS, Hearings Officer; SERGEANT SYKES, Sergeant; C/O R. BROWN; C/O VANOVER; C/O CARTER; C/O MESSER; C/O OFFICER MESSER; C/O SHEPPARD; C/O DUPIE; C/O SLUSS; C/O AKERS; C/O GIBSON; JOHN DOES; JANE DOES; L. T. LAMBERT, Lieutenant; LIEUTENANT BLEVINS; LIEUTENANT LYLE; SERGEANT HILL; YOUNCE, Unit Manager; SERGEANT BARTON; SERGEANT MILLER,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Chief District Judge. (7:14-cv-00257-GEC)

---

Submitted: April 13, 2015

Decided: April 22, 2015

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kevin Snodgrass, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Snodgrass, Jr., appeals the district court's orders (1) dismissing this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action without prejudice for failure to comply with a court order; and (2) denying his motions for reconsideration and appointment of counsel. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Snodgrass v. Clark, No. 7:14-cv-00257-GEC (W.D. Va. July 1 & Aug. 11, 2014). 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