

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-7425**

---

MICHAEL EDWARD BROOKS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

H. L. BUNCH, individually and in his official capacity as Police Chief; J. L. SPEAR, individually and in official capacity as Police Lieutenant; MARK BYRUM, individually and in official capacity as Police Officer; ALFRED SANDERLIN, individually and in official capacity as Police Officer; JAMIE LACOMBE, individually and in official capacity as Police Officer; MALCOLM MOURING, individually and in official capacity as Police Officer; AUBREY NMI SAMPLE, individually and in official capacity as Police Officer; RICKY KING, individually and in official capacity as Police Officer; ROGER JONES, individually and in official capacity as Police Sergeant; KEITH TEAGUE; ELIZABETH CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF ELIZABETH CITY; SAM KEITH, individually and in official capacity as Deputy,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Elizabeth City. Terrence W. Boyle, Chief District Judge. (CA-98-15-2-BO)

---

Submitted: February 25, 1999

Decided: March 9, 1999

---

Before HAMILTON, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Edward Brooks, Appellant Pro Se. Kevin Neil Lewis, BAKER, JENKINS, JONES & DALY, P.A., Ahoskie, North Carolina; David Keith Teague, Danny Ray Glover, Jr., Elizabeth City, North Carolina; Mark Allen Davis, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael E. Brooks appeals the district court's order denying relief on his civil rights and state law claims complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Brooks v. Bunch, No. CA-98-15-2-BO (E.D.N.C. Sept. 4, 1998). We deny Appellee Keith Teague's motions for summary affirmance and damages and costs under Fed. R. App. P. 38. 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