

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7330

JOSE ARELLANO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

PEDRO GARCIA QUINTERO; VICTOR HERNANDEZ;
ANTONIO HERNANDEZ; LORENZO ROJAS; JUAN HER-
RERA; ARTURO NAVARRETE; FLORENTINO BOJORQUEZ,

Plaintiffs,

versus

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; U.S. IMMIGRATION &
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-7331

PEDRO GARCIA QUINTERO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

JOSE ARELLANO; VICTOR HERNANDEZ; ANTONIO HER-
NANDEZ; LORENZO ROJAS; JUAN HERRERA; ARTURO
NAVARRETE; FLORENTINO BOJORQUEZ,

Plaintiffs,

versus

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; U.S. IMMIGRATION &
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-7332

VICTOR HERNANDEZ,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

JOSE ARELLANO; ANTONIO HERNANDEZ; LORENZO
ROJAS; JUAN HERRERA; ARTURO NAVARRETE;
FLORENTINO BOJORQUEZ,

Plaintiffs,

versus

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA; U.S. IMMIGRATION &
NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-
trict of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Malcolm J. Howard, District
Judge. (CA-98-703-5-H)

Submitted: December 16, 1999

Decided: December 22, 1999

Before MURNAGHAN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jose Arellano, Pedro Garcia Quintero, Victor Hernandez, Appellants Pro Se. William McBlief, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants Jose Arellano, Pedro Garcia Quintero, and Victor Hernandez appeal the district court's judgment denying relief on their civil rights complaint contending they were subjected to cruel and unusual punishment because of their nationality. We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Arellano v. North Carolina, No. CA-98-703-5-H (E.D.N.C. Sept. 8, 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