

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-7171

PAMELA J. ANDERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JEFFERY DILLMAN, Assistant Warden, Operations, Fluvanna Correctional Center for Women; ROBERT ARMSTRONG, Institutional Investigator, Fluvanna Correctional Center for women; PATRICIA HUFFMAN, Warden, Fluvanna Correctional Center for Women; MELISSA HOUCHEMS, inmate Hearings Officer, FCCW, sued in official and individual capacity; PAUL RICE, Treatment Program Supervisor, FCCW, sued in his official and individual capacities; KIM WARE, Secretary, sued in her official and individual capacity; TRACY MEYERHOFFER, Grievance Coordinator and Human Rights Advocate, FCCW, sued in official and individual capacities; E. R. BARRACK, Representative, Investigative Unit of DOC Internal Affairs, sued in his official and individual capacities; LAURA ANDERSON, Acting Principal of Department of Correctional Education, sued in her official and individual capacities; COURTNEY DAVIS, Counselor, sued in her official and individual capacities; DONNA ANDERSON, Unit Manager, sued in her official and individual capacities; LARRY HUFFMAN, Regional Director, DOC's Northern Regional Office #2; DEWEY JENNINGS, Officer, Operation, FCCW; DEREK ANDERSON, Major, Heal of Security, FCCW,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, Chief District Judge. (CA-01-768-7)

Submitted: January 31, 2003

Decided: February 14, 2003

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Pamela J. Anderson, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

Pamela J. Anderson appeals the district court's order denying relief on her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we grant the motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Anderson v. Dillman, No. CA-01-768-7 (W.D. Va. July 19, 2002). 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