

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-7542**

---

BEVERLY RICARDO MANGUM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

L. W. HUFFMAN; J. B. TAYLOR; D. C. STEWART; A.  
L. CRAWFORD; SERGEANT BERRY; H. BOOTH-BROWN;  
C/O CARTER, JR.; G. DEDRICK; LYNN COX; G. P.  
HACTON; LIEUTENANT JONES; M. W. MURPHY; P. N.  
KNIGHT, Captain; S. W. HOLLOR; T. S. MILLER;  
F. S. ROBINSON; T. STEWART; C/O PROCTOR; L.  
SHEFFER; ASSISTANT WARDEN JARVIS; S. FARRISH;  
C/O KEY; C/O HAROLD; SERGEANT HENRY; L.  
PAINTER; CAPTAIN SPITLER; R.R. HOLLOWAY; C/O  
EUTSLER; P. JOHNSON; C/O WALTERS; R. DAWSON;  
J. LEE; L. M. SAUNDERS; P. MASSIE; C/O SPEARS;  
R. L. FRADY; J. H. LYLE, Lieutenant; C/O  
FLETCHER; C/O GARRETT; SERGEANT SLIVER;  
SERGEANT TAYLOR; D. SWISHER; R. BOYER,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SERGEANT HENNY; D. N. FOLEY; C/O ALLEN;  
SERGEANT HARRIS; K. BAILEY; UNKNOWN MEMBERS OF  
THE APPEALS UNIT,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western Dis-  
trict of Virginia, at Roanoke. Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge.  
(CA-94-403-R)

---

---

Submitted: April 15, 1996

Decided: April 23, 1996

---

Before ERVIN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and CHAPMAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Beverly Ricardo Mangum, Appellant Pro Se. Pamela Anne Sargent, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1988) complaint and Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend the judgment. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no abuse of discretion and no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Mangum v. Huffman, No. CA-94-403-R (W.D. Va. Sept. 5 & 15, 1995). 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