UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6172

BRYAN KEITH RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

v.

MR. SMITH, Associate Warden of Prison Operations; MR. RUSSELL A. PERDUE, Warden of the Entire Prison; MR. YARBER, Lieutenant of the SIS Department; MR. YEAGER, A Federal Employee at the Camp; MS. PARK-DAVISON, Unit Manager of Building A.; MR. WEAVER, Health Service Administrator of the Prison; MR. CLARK, Education Supervisor at the Prison; MR. BECK, Prison Education Specialist; MS. THOMPKINS, An Educational/Teacher at the Prison; COUNSELOR C TAYLOR, Counsel for Unit A-3 at the Prison; DOES 1 THROUGH 8, BOP Employee,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Elkins. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (2:14-cv-00064-JPB-MJA)

Submitted: August 26, 2016 Decided: September 13, 2016

Before KING, SHEDD and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bryan Keith Richardson, Appellant Pro Se. Erin K. Reisenweber, Assistant United States Attorney, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bryan Keith Richardson appeals the district court's order adopting the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his complaint filed pursuant to Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm substantially for the reasons stated by the district court. Richardson v. Smith, No. 2:14-cv-00064-JPB-MJA (N.D. W. Va. Jan. 20, 2016). In addition, we find that Richardson's requests for discovery were properly denied because the evidence sought for discovery would not have created a genuine issue of material fact sufficient to defeat summary judgment. See Ingle ex re. Ingle v. Yelton, 439 F.3d 191, 195 (4th Cir. 2006). We deny Richardson's motion for appropriate relief and 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