

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-6964**

---

RICHARD DAVID COOPER; GEORGE WILSON; JOHN  
TRIPPETT; JAMES BRITTON; KENNEY EDWARDS;  
WILLIAM YOUNG; HENRY DAVIS; GARY BRIGHT;  
GREGORY HAMILTON; CHARLES HILL; ANTHONY  
PRESSBERRY; BRIAN STOKELING; IRVIN BURNS, JR.;  
THOMAS MATTINGLY; VINCIN HARPSTER; HENRY  
HARRIS; JESSE COBBS; JONATHAN BORK; JOHN  
CARTER; CHARLES WRIGHT; WILLIAM BAKER-EL;  
LOWELL D. HOWELL; DONALD FITZGERALD

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

EVERETTE PRATT,

Plaintiff,

versus

PRISON HEALTH SERVICE, INCORPORATED; PHARMACY  
SERVICES, INCORPORATED; MARYLAND DIVISION OF  
CORRECTION,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Frederic N. Smalkin, Chief District Judge.  
(CA-01-1428-S)

---

Submitted: December 12, 2001

Decided: January 11, 2002

---

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Richard David Cooper, George Wilson, John Trippett, James Britton, Kenney Edwards, William Young, Henry Davis, Gary Bright, Gregory Hamilton, Charles Hill, Anthony Pressberry, Brian Stokeling, Irvin Burns, Jr., Thomas Mattingly, Vincin Harpster, Henry Harris, Jesse Cobbs, Jonathan Bork, John Carter, Charles Wright, William Baker-El, Lowell D. Howell, Donald Fitzgerald, Appellants Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's order dismissing their 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2001) medical treatment claim. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Further, we decline to review Appellants' claims raised for the first time on appeal. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Cooper v. Prison Health Servs., No. CA-01-1428-S (D. Md. May 23, 2001). We deny Appellants' motion for appointment of counsel. 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