

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-2199

TERESA BROCK; ARIEL GHEE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL; ST. JOSEPH'S MEDICAL
CENTER, INCORPORATED; NICOLETTE MORRIS, Doc-
tor; JACKIE BAILEY, Registered Nurse; DARLA
KRIYA, Registered Nurse; KAYE THOMPSON,
Registered Nurse; UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER,
ANN MARIE BONDS; MT. WASHINGTON PEDIATRIC
HOSPITAL; SUSAN MCCOLLEY, Doctor; CHILD
PROTECTIVE SERVICES; CAROLYN BEERS; ALICIA
MELVIN; DAWNA BLAKE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. John R. Hargrove, Senior District Judge.
(CA-96-1241-HAR)

Submitted: December 10, 1996 Decided: December 23, 1996

Before HAMILTON, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed as modified by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Teresa Brock, Ariel Ghee, Appellants Pro Se. John Russell
Penhallegon, SMITH, SOMERVILLE & CASE, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's order denying relief in their 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 1983, 1985 (1994) action in which they also alleged racial discrimination in violation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We have reviewed the record with respect to the Title VI claim and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the disposition of this claim on the reasoning of the district court. Brock v. St. Joseph's Hosp., No. CA-96-1241-HAR (D. Md. July 24, 1996). We find, however, that the § 1983 claim should have been dismissed as frivolous under 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e) (West Supp. 1996), rather than pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), and affirm the dismissal on that basis. Finally, we find that the § 1985 claim was properly dismissed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, as appellants have failed to allege specific facts supporting a claim of conspiracy in violation of § 1985. 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 AS MODIFIED