

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-1696**

---

ROGER R. OLIVA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MICHELLE E. BOYER; SUPERIOR COURT OF  
PENNSYLVANIA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

DAUPHIN COUNTY COURTS, PENNSYLVANIA; FAIRFAX  
DISTRICT OFFICE/VA DSS; NANCY HILL; NANCY  
CRAWFORD; DON HEPLER; ESTELLE BRYANT; CHARLES  
ROARK; FAIRFAX J&D R COURT; GAYLORD FINCH;  
FRANK SEDI; JANE DELBRIDGE; MICHAEL VALENTINE;  
DEBRA TOLAND; DAVID SCHELL; LINDA BOZOKY;  
CLARENCE MORRISON; JEANINE TURGEON; MARK  
SELLIKER; CHERYL BENKOVIC; DAVID A. SZEWCZAK;  
PATRICIA A. MCKEEVER,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Senior  
District Judge. (CA-95-562-A)

---

Submitted: August 27, 1998

Decided: September 11, 1998

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Roger R. Oliva, Appellant Pro Se. Michelle E. Boyer, Appellee Pro  
Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Roger R. Oliva appeals the district court's order dismissing Defendants Michelle E. Boyer and the Superior Court of Pennsylvania in his civil action. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. While the district court dismissed the Defendants for reasons stated from the bench, and Oliva did not provide a transcript of the proceeding in the record, see Fed. R. App. P. 10(b)(2), we affirm the order. Oliva seeks review of state court proceedings regarding domestic relations orders, which is not a basis for federal jurisdiction. See Ankenbrandt v. Richards, 504 U.S. 689 (1992). To the extent that Oliva raises a 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West 1994 & Supp. 1998) claim, the Defendant court system is not a person as defined by 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983, and Boyer is not a state actor. See 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983.

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