

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-7410**

---

ROGER GOMEZ ALSTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DONALD R. GUILLORY,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

**No. 95-7457**

---

ROGER GOMEZ ALSTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DAVID G. LOWE, Magistrate; JOHN DOE; DONALD R.  
GUILLORY; EDWARD MURRAY; ROSE M. LEABOUGH;  
ROBERT H. ANDERSON, III; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER  
MASSENBURG,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

No. 95-7668

---

ROGER GOMEZ ALSTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DONALD R. GUILLORY,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CA-94-145-3, CA-95-427)

---

Submitted: March 19, 1996

Decided: April 2, 1996

---

Before HALL and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Nos. 95-7410 and 95-7668 dismissed and No. 95-7457 affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Roger Gomez Alston, Appellant Pro Se. Robert H. Anderson, III, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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:

In Nos. 95-7410 and 95-7668, Appellant seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (1988) petition and denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Appellant's motion for a certificate of probable cause to appeal and dismiss the appeals on the reasoning of the district court. Alston v. Guillory, No. CA-94-145-3 (E.D. Va. June 9, 1985, Aug. 8, 1995 & Sept. 8, 1995). We also deny as moot Appellant's motion to place this case in abeyance.

In No. 95-7457, Appellant appeals the district court's order denying preliminary injunctive relief in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1988) action. Finding no abuse of discretion by the district court, we affirm. Alston v. Lowe, No. CA-95-427 (E.D. Va. Sept. 11, 1995). In light of this disposition, we deny Appellant's motion to expedite his appeal as moot. 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.

No. 95-7410 - DISMISSED

No. 95-7457 - AFFIRMED

No. 95-7668 - DISMISSED