

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-7385

RODRICK B. CHATMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SAM MCVEY, Detective; GREGORY BAKER,
Detective,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WARDEN OF GREENSVILLE CORRECTIONAL CENTER; THE CITY OF BRISTOL, VIRGINIA; DELAWARE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA; BRISTOL CITY JAIL; POWHATAN RECEPTION & CLASSIFICATION CENTER; BRISTOL, VIRGINIA SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; STAFFORD COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; BRISTOL POLICE DEPARTMENT; TINICUM POLICE DEPARTMENT; GEORGE M. WARREN, JR., Esquire; BEVERLY HANEY, Esquire; WILLIAM H. RYAN, JR., Esquire; WAYNE PUNSHON, Esquire; JOHN F.X. RILEY, Esquire; ROBERT T. LYTHEGOE, Chief of Police for Tinicum; JOHN A. DOE, Officer; JOHN B. DOE, Officer; JOHN C. DOE, Officer; JOHN D. DOE, Officer; GRAY ROBINSON, Esquire; DARRELL POE, Esquire; JACKSON & ROBINSON; BRADFORD & POE; DANIEL FINNEGAN, Esquire; PATRICK J. CONNER, Esquire; DENISE M. CONRAD; PATRICIA JOHNSON, Esquire; JOHN W. PERSON, Esquire; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; STAFFORD COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; THE CITY OF BRISTOL, VIRGINIA,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge. (CA-95-1285-7)

Submitted: March 22, 2001

Decided: March 28, 2001

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rodrnick B. Chatman, Appellant Pro Se. Steven Ray Minor, ELLIOTT, LAWSON & POMRENKE, Bristol, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Rodrnick Bernard Chatman appeals the district court's order denying his motion for civil or criminal contempt. 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. Chatman v. McVey, No. CA-95-1285-7 (W.D. Va. Sept 15, 2001). 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