

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6700

EMMANUEL E. SEWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

J. MICHAEL STOUFFER; BOBBY P. SHEARIN; RICHARD R. GRAHAM;
LIEUTENANT J. L. HARBAUGH; LIEUTENANT D. DURST; LIEUTENANT
YACHENCH; LIEUTENANT HAGGARD; SERGEANT SIMMONS; SERGEANT R.
R. SHANK; SERGEANT R. H. LIPHOLD, JR.; SERGEANT LANCASTER;
SERGEANT G. B. MCALPINE; SERGEANT M. BULGER; SERGEANT D. L.
SMITH; SERGEANT MCKENZIE; L. GIRVIN, CO II; P. DEIST, CO II;
J. A. FRIEND, CO II; R. KEEFER, CO II; J. W. PRITTS, CO II;
KISNER, CO II; R. R. HOLLINS, CO II; T. A. MELLOTT, CO II;
KENNELL, J.A., CO II; PETERS, CO II; KALBAUGH; M. HUBNER;
SMITH; JODI STOUFFER; TINA M. GERAGHTY; SUSIE CUNNINGHAM;
SHARON BAUCOM; MARY JOE SABETTELLI; DR. BEN OTEYZA; DR.
MAJID ARNAOUT; P.A. GREG FLURY; NURSE STEVE BRAY; NURSE
AFRICA; NURSE CHRISTINA B.; NURSE JANICE GILMORE; DR. JAMES
HOLWAGER; SHERRY HEFFERCAMP; LAURA MOULDEN; OFFICE OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WARDEN; STEPHEN Z. MEEHAN; JOSEPH B. TETRAULT; PAULINE K.
WHITE,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District
Judge. (8:11-cv-00614-DKC)

Submitted: October 15, 2012

Decided: October 30, 2012

Before WILKINSON and DAVIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Emmanuel E. Sewell, Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Judith Lane-Weber, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland; Philip Melton Andrews, Ryan Alexander Mitchell, KRAMON & GRAHAM, PA, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Emmanuel E. Sewell appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Sewell v. Stouffer, No. 8:11-cv-00614-DKC (D. Md. Mar. 9, 2012). We deny Sewell's pending motions. 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