

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 97-7500**

---

VICTOR TOWNES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF BALTIMORE; UNKNOWN FIELD DIRECTORS OF  
THE BALTIMORE F.B.I. OFFICE; BALTIMORE CITY  
POLICE DEPARTMENT; VAUGHN FOREMAN, Trooper;  
SAMUEL N. WICHNER, Special Agent,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

UNKNOWN MARYLAND STATE TROOPER; UNKNOWN BALTI-  
MORE CITY UNIFORM, and possible plainclothes,  
POLICE OFFICERS AND THEIR SUPERIORS; UNKNOWN  
BALTIMORE FIRE AND AMBULANCE SERVICE ATTEN-  
DANTS; UNKNOWN FBI AGENTS; UNKNOWN BALTIMORE  
CITY POLICE COMMISSIONER; UNKNOWN COMMISSIONER  
FOR THE BALTIMORE CITY FIRE AND AMBULANCE  
SERVICES,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. William N. Nickerson, District Judge.  
(CA-95-3529-WMN)

---

Submitted: February 26, 1998

Decided: March 19, 1998

---

Before WILKINS, NIEMEYER, and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Victor Townes, Appellant Pro Se. William Rowe Phelan, Jr., OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR, Baltimore, Maryland; Lynne Ann Battaglia, United States Attorney, Charles Joseph Peters, Sr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland; Duane Anthony Verderaime, BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland; John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland; Donald Eugene Hoffman, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Pikesville, Maryland, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 dismissing certain Defendants and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Townes v. Baltimore, No. CA-95-3529-WMN (D. Md. Oct. 3, 1996, Dec. 18, 1996, and Sept. 19, 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