

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7290

MUHAMMAD ABD SALEEM EURY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GENE SHINAULT; JACK LEE; LIEUTENANT MCCLANA-
HAN; SERGEANT VANDYKE; SERGEANT HORTON; COR-
RECTIONAL OFFICER FIELDS; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER
MCNERLIN; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER MARTIN; CORREC-
TIONAL OFFICER SANDSTROM; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER
RIFE; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER LOONEY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior District
Judge. (CA-99-504)

Submitted: November 18, 1999

Decided: November 24, 1999

Before WILKINS, HAMILTON, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed in part and dismissed in part by unpublished per curiam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

Muhammad Abd Saleem Eury, Appellant Pro Se. Mark Ralph Davis,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Muhammad Eury appeals the district court's order denying his request for a temporary restraining order and for preliminary injunctive relief. Eury maintained that the actions and threats of certain prison officials suggest that his health and safety are in danger and therefore requested injunctive relief by way of transfer to another facility.

To the extent that Eury appeals the denial of a temporary restraining order, such denial is not ordinarily appealable. See Virginia v. Tenneco, Inc., 538 F.2d 1026, 1029-30 (4th Cir. 1976). Because the case presents no exceptional circumstances, we decline to review the denial of a temporary restraining order, and dismiss the appeal as it pertains to that order. To the extent that Eury appeals the denial of injunctive relief, we have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion denying preliminary injunctive relief and find no abuse of discretion. See Direx Israel, Ltd. v. Breakthrough Medical Corp., 952 F.2d 802, 812-13 (4th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, we affirm the denial of injunctive relief on the reasoning of the district court. See Eury v. Shinault, No. CA-99-504 (W.D. Va. Sept. 15, 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 IN PART AND DISMISSED IN PART