

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 97-2034**

---

JAMES M. BOWLING,

Appellant,

LAWRENCE E. BOWLING,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JEANETTE MCVAY, individually and officially as Sheriff, Jackson County; D. J. MARTIN, individually and officially as Chief Deputy, Jackson County; DAVID MOORE, individually and officially as Prosecuting Attorney, Jackson County; LEAH R. TAYLOR, individually and officially as Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Jackson County; CAROLYN MONK; WILLIAM MONK; CHARLES E. MCCARTY, individually and officially as Judge, Fifth Judicial Circuit,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Parkersburg. Charles H. Haden II, Chief District Judge. (CA-97-463-6)

---

Submitted: June 30, 1998

Decided: July 16, 1998

---

Before NEIMEYER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James M. Bowling, Lawrence E. Bowling, Appellants Pro Se. Carolyn Monk, William Monk, Appellees; Steven Paul McGowan, Ancil Glenn Ramey, STEPTOE & JOHNSON, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In an attempt to determine whether his son, James Bowling, is the father of two minor children, Lawrence Bowling filed two actions in West Virginia state court. His lawsuits were unsuccessful, and Lawrence then filed the subject action raising various state law claims related to the original state actions. The magistrate judge issued a report determining that the state court judge named as a Defendant was absolutely immune from suit, that the claims against the remaining Defendants were barred by principles of res judicata and collateral estoppel, and that the motion to amend the Complaint should be denied in the court's discretion. The district court adopted the report and dismissed the action. This appeal followed.

We have reviewed the record and the order of the district court adopting the report of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Bowling v. McVay, No. CA-97-463-6 (S.D.W. Va. July 3, 1997). 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