

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 02-7705

---

MICHAEL RAY HARVEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DANIEL T. MAHON, Warden; CAPTAIN DAVIS,  
C.C.A.; D. A. BRAXTON, Warden, ROSP; PAUL  
WILLIAMS; VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;  
R. FLEMING, Major; J. K. VAUGHN; R. T. COKER;  
V. SMITH, Doctor; RUFUS FLEMING; DOCTOR KING;  
DAVID A. SMITH, Assistant Warden, H.C.C.; J.  
REDD, Segregation Counselor, H.C.C.,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER BUTLER; V. L. EVANS;  
WILLIAM RODGERS, Regional Administrator,  
Central Region, VDOC; L. DOTSON, Warden,  
L.C.C.; S. FLEENOR, Grievance Coordinator at  
ROSP, VDOC; JOHN DOE, I, person named unknown  
at C.C.A., VDOC, employee at C.C.A. charges  
with duty of disciplinary hearings; JOHN DOE,  
II, person named unknown at C.C.A., VDOC,  
employee at C.C.A. charges with duty of  
Ombudsman for D.O.C.; JOHN DOE, III, person  
named unknown at C.C.A., employee head of  
medical staff; JOHN DOE, IV, person unknown at  
VDOC, Director of Medical Services and Medical  
Policy of D.O.C.,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior District Judge. (CA-02-829-7)

---

Submitted: March 6, 2003

Decided: April 4, 2003

---

Before MICHAEL and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Ray Harvey, Appellant Pro Se. Mark Ralph Davis, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, Jim Harold Guynn, Jr., GUYNN & MEMMER, P.C., Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael Ray Harvey appeals the district court's order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction in this action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Harvey v. Mahon, No. CA-02-829-7 (W.D. Va. Sept. 11, 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