

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-2013

CHARLES THOMAS CURRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RANDY WALKER, Individually and in his official capacity; C. R. BYRD; BYRDS FOODS STORES, INCORPORATED; LOWES FOOD STORES; ALEX LEE, INCORPORATED; T. E. SAUNDERS, Individually and in his official capacity; JOHN DOE; JOHN GLENN; THE BURLINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; THE CITY OF BURLINGTON,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-2039

CHARLES THOMAS CURRY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LINDA FRANKLIN, Individually and in her official capacity; 24-7 BAIL BONDING SERVICE, INCORPORATED; BOBBY DAVIS, Individually and in his official capacity; JOHN DOE, Individually and in his/her/their official capacity(ies); JOHN GLENN, Individually and in his official capacity; THE BURLINGTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF BURLINGTON,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. Frank W. Bullock, Jr., District Judge. (CA-97-927-1, CA-97-928-1)

Submitted: November 4, 1999

Decided: November 9, 1999

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles Thomas Curry, Appellant Pro Se. Alan William Duncan, Richard Andrew Coughlin, SMITH, HELMS, MULLISS & MOORE, L.L.P., Greensboro, North Carolina; Reginald B. Gillespie, Jr., Keith David Burns, Jonathan Chad Sauls, FAISON & GILLESPIE, Durham, North Carolina; Christopher Thomas Watkins, Graham, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Charles Thomas Curry appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Curry v. Franklin, Nos. CA-97-927-1; CA-97-928-1 (M.D.N.C. June 18 & June 23, 1999). 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