

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-6469**

---

CLINTON BEDELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GREENSVILLE CORRECTIONAL CENTER; F.J.C.A.;  
VERMONT DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; JOHN F.  
GORCZYK; TERRY MOSHER; SHAUNA ROWELL; VIRGINIA  
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; RON ANGELONE;  
INTERSTATE COMPACT CONTRACT #0946130; D. A.  
GARRAGHTY; C. DAVIS; R. DAVIS; GENE JOHNSON;  
WARNER; JIM GILMORE; SAMUEL BATES; F. S.  
SPENCE; M. MILLARD; NURSE BONEY; VERMONT  
GOVERNOR; DOCTOR GENERAL; DOCTOR GAY; DOCTOR  
LEWIS; DOCTOR FIELDING; N. LABRIOLA; B.  
CARABELLO; F. ROACH; COMMANDING OFFICER  
EVERETTE; HOWARD DEAN; VERMONT-VIRGINIA  
INTERSTATE COMPACT #0946130; FINANCIAL  
INSTITUTIONS AND TRUST ACCOUNTS PAID BY  
VERMONT TO VIRGINIA TO HOUSE INMATES AT  
GREENSVILLE; SECURITY OFFICERS; ISAIAH PECK;  
MITCHELL; GAMBRELL; EVERETT; GARCIA;  
LIEUTENANT WALKER; M. L. BOONE, Sergeant;  
CHISM; JACKSON; WILLIAMS; CLERY; CARPENTER;  
BROWN; PHILIPS; DELOACH; LAWRENCE; R. CLARK;  
CARPINO, Caseworker-mental health; CURIEL; B.  
BLAKELY; MISS BROOKS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District  
Judge. (CA-01-892-2)

---

Submitted: May 30, 2002

Decided: June 7, 2002

---

Before WILKINS, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Clinton Bedell, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Clinton Bedell appeals the district court order and judgment dismissing his complaint for failing to include an original signature as required by Rule 11(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. We have reviewed the record and the district court's order and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Bedell v. Greensville Correctional, No. CA-01-892-2 (E.D. Va. Mar. 12, 2002). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal conclusions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED