

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-7008

AFNAN JEROME PARKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SUPERINTENDENT PROFFITT; MAJOR FRAZIER; LIEU-
TENANT ROESSNER; SERGEANT WHALEN; SERGEANT
MCDANIELS; CORPORAL BREEDING; CORPORAL
CRYSTAL; PRIVATE COLT; COUNSELOR JOHNSON;
DOCTOR PASTERNAK; DOCTOR IRVING; SERGEANT
MCCAFFERTY; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; GOVERNOR
WILDER,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 96-7009

AFNAN JEROME PARKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SUPERINTENDENT PROFFITT; MAJOR FRAZIER; LIEU-
TENANT ROESSNER; SERGEANT WHALEN; SERGEANT
MCDANIELS; CORPORAL BREEDING; CORPORAL
CRYSTAL; PRIVATE COLT; COUNSELOR JOHNSON;
DOCTOR PASTERNAK; DOCTOR IRVING; SERGEANT
MCCAFFERTY; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; GOVERNOR
WILDER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James H. Michael, Jr., Senior District Judge. (CA-94-815-R)

Submitted: March 27, 1997

Decided: April 2, 1997

Before RUSSELL, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Afnan Jerome Parker, Appellant Pro Se. Mark Douglas Loftis, WOODS, ROGERS & HAZLEGROVE, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Afnan Jerome Parker appeals from the district court's orders (1) adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing all of the claims in his complaint except the Eighth Amendment claim, (2) entering judgment on the jury verdict against Parker on his Eighth Amendment claim, (3) denying his motion for preparation of transcripts at government expense, and (4) refusing, for lack of jurisdiction, to act on Parker's motion to amend or for a new trial and motion to produce transcripts and court documents. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny the Appellees' motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute, deny Parker's motions for appointment of counsel and for a new trial, and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Parker v. Proffitt, No. CA-94-815-R (W.D. Va. Apr. 26, 1996, and May 30, 1996). 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