

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2116

ROSE C. POWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

SHANNELL POWELL; SHAMELA POWELL; RUENALL
FREDRICK,

Plaintiffs,

versus

TONY A. KELLER; JORGE SOSA; JASON COY REID;
TIMOTHY JAMES BREWER; LARRY WATERS; GRETCHEN
C.F. SHAPPERT; RICHARD L. VOORHEES; CARL HORN,
III, Magistrate Judge; GREGORY A. FOREST;
JAYME MILLER; UNITED STATES MARSHAL'S SERVICE;
CATAWBA COUNTY; CATAWBA COUNTY BOARD OF
COMMISSIONERS; SHERIFF OF CATAWBA COUNTY;
CATAWBA COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; COLDWELL
BANKER BOYD & HASSELL, INCORPORATED REALTORS;
ELVALORIE MATTHEWS; RICHARD MCDONNELL; MARK T.
CALLOWAY; NEWTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; CONOVER
POLICE DEPARTMENT; WILLIAM A. BRAFFORD,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Graham C. Mullen,
Chief District Judge. (CA-03-160-5-MU)

Submitted: February 9, 2005

Decided: February 14, 2005

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Rose C. Powell, Appellant Pro Se. James Redfern Morgan, Jr., Robert Danny Mason, Jr., WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Edward Laughtin Eatman, Jr., Elizabeth Ann Martineau, HEDRICK, EATMAN, GARDNER & KINCHELOE, Charlotte, North Carolina; Scott Douglas MacLatchie, Sean Francis Perrin, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina; Jennifer Ann Youngs, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Charlotte, North Carolina; William Anthony Navarro, WISHART, NORRIS, HENNINGER & PITTMAN, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Rose C. Powell appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to defendants on her civil rights complaint that alleged violations based upon the forfeiture of real property. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Powell v. Keller, No. CA-03-160-5-MU (W.D.N.C. Aug. 24, 2004). 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