

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7720

WALTER D. BOOKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

R. TIMMONS, Unit Manager; B. M. CLAUDE, Lieutenant; T. ROBINSON, Sergeant; G. D. FAULCON, Sergeant; LIEUTENANT TAYLOR; M. L. ROOK, Correctional Officer,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

A. DAVID ROBINSON, Chief of Corrections Operations; WENDY S. HOBBS, Regional Administrator; EDDIE L. PEARSON, Lead Warden; C. PARKER, Warden; J. HARRIS, Warden; C. BOONE, Regional Ombudsman; S. TAPP, Human Rights Advocate; K. WHITEHEAD, Grievance Coordinator; L. GOODE, Unit Manager; D. DUGGER, Institutional Hearings Officer,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv-00555-JCC-IDD)

Submitted: March 29, 2016

Decided: April 7, 2016

Before AGEE and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Vacated and remanded by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Walter D. Booker, Appellant Pro Se. Margaret Hoehl O'Shea,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, John Michael
Parsons, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Virginia inmate Walter Booker appeals the district court's order denying his request for a preliminary injunction in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action. The district court denied the requested injunction because Booker did not show that he could satisfy any of the factors set forth in Winter v. Natural Resources Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). The court made no specific findings of fact in reaching this conclusion. Rule 52(a)(2), Fed. R. Civ. P., requires that the district court make particularized findings of fact supporting its decision to grant or deny a preliminary injunction; such findings are necessary in order for an appellate court to conduct meaningful appellate review. See H & R Block Tax Servs. LLC v. Acevedo-Lopez, 742 F.3d 1074, 1078 (8th Cir. 2014); Kisano Trade & Invest Ltd. v. Lemster, 505 F. App'x 147, 148 (3d Cir. 2012). In the absence of any such specific findings, we are constrained to conclude that the district court abused its discretion in denying the requested injunction. See WV Ass'n of Club Owners & Fraternal Servs., Inc. v. Musgrave, 553 F.3d 292, 298 (4th Cir. 2009) (stating standard of review). We accordingly vacate the decision of the district court and remand for further proceedings. 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.

VACATED AND REMANDED