

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-7281

MICHAEL HANNON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RON ANGELONE; STAN YOUNG, Warden; L. T. JANEWAY, Lieutenant; SERGEANT KENDRICK; MAJOR YATES; ADAM HARVEY, Assistant Warden; CAPTAIN TAYLOR; OFFICER WYNN; OFFICER NUNLEY; OFFICER POWERS; ASSISTANT WARDEN PHILLIPS; JEFFREY HEAD, Sergeant; OFFICER COLLINS; LIEUTENANT SNIDER; J. GILLEY; OFFICER SALYERS; OFFICER OLINGER; B. GILLIAM; M. BLEVINS; M. SALYERS, Disciplinary Hearing Officer; B. RODGERS; OFFICER MANN; R. MULLINS; SERGEANT STANLEY; JOHN MASELLA, Captain; OFFICER DOTSON; DOCTOR CHARLOTTE; M. DUNCAN; CHAPLAIN ROY; LYNN MILLING, Major, Connecticut Department of Corrections; JOHN ARMSTRONG, Connecticut Department of Corrections; NURSE BALLARD, WRSP; DR. WILSON, WRSP; CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SERVICES, WRSP; NURSE KELLY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior District Judge. (CA-00-281-7)

Submitted: December 12, 2003

Decided: February 2, 2004

Before WILLIAMS, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Hannon, Appellant Pro Se. Susan Foster Barr, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Steven R. Strom, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CONNECTICUT, Hartford, Connecticut; John David McChesney, Edward Joseph McNelis, III, RAWLS & MCNELIS, P.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael Hannon appeals the district court's orders dismissing several of his claims for failure to state a claim and granting Defendants' motions for summary judgment on his remaining claims on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Hannon v. Angelone, No. CA-00-281-7 (W.D. Va. June 26, 2000; June 11, 2003). 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