

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

DAVID WATSON,

Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

No. 99-6949

LIEUTENANT TADDOCK; CAPTAIN

BRINSON; BETTY ZIMMERMAN, Nurse,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh.
James C. Fox, District Judge.
(CA-99-252-5-F)

Submitted: November 16, 1999

Decided: February 28, 2000

Before WIDENER and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges,
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam
opinion.

COUNSEL

David Watson, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

David Watson appeals the district court's order denying relief on his complaint filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999). In his complaint, Watson claimed that prison officials denied him access to the courts and provided inadequate medical care for several conditions, including headaches, chest pain, numbness in his leg, blood in his stool, depression, and toothaches. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, as to the claims Watson raised in his complaint, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Watson v. Taddock, No. CA-99-252-5-F (E.D.N.C. July 7, 1999).

In his informal brief on appeal, Watson claims that prison officials at Wayne County Detention Center violated his rights by allowing him to be exposed to tuberculosis, which was diagnosed on his admission to Central Prison. He claims he now must undergo a six-month course of medication for tuberculosis. It is unclear whether he has dormant or active tuberculosis. See DeGidio v. Pung, 920 F.2d 525, 527 (8th Cir. 1990) (noting that few people with dormant tuberculosis develop the active disease). This claim was not presented to the district court and is, accordingly, not properly before this court for review. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993). Therefore, we dismiss the appeal in part without prejudice to Watson's right to file a § 1983 action raising this claim.

We deny Watson's motion for discovery. 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 IN PART; DISMISSED IN PART