UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-7677

STEPHEN A. SHARP,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LYNN CAWLEY, a/k/a Lynn Cawley Wilson; ANDREW S. WILSON, individually and in his official capacity; WILSON SERVICES; WAYNE A. CAWLEY; DANA A. LAWHORNE, individually and in his official capacity; S. RANDOLPH SENGEL, individually and in his official capacity; KAREN M. S. WALDEN, individually and in her official capacity; PATRICK J. PRENDERGAST; JOHN E. REGENTIN; JOSEPH A. CONDO, individually and in his professional capacity; REES, BROOME & DIAZ, PC; JOSEPH A. CONDO & ASSOCIATES, PC; ROBERT C. DUNN, individually and in his professional capacity; COHEN, DUNN & SINCLAIR, PC; COHEN, DUNN & CURCIO, PC; MICHAEL D. RYAN, individually and in his official capacity; MARY L. HILL, individually and in her official capacity; MARGARET A. DHILLON, individually and in her official capacity; CORA LYNN C. GOLDSBOROUGH, individually and in her capacity as agent of the city of Alexandria; BARBARA WARD, individually and in her official capacity; CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, Virginia; JOANNE C. LINDENBERGER; SPRINGFIELD PSYCHOTHERAPY & CONSULTATION CENTER; JUDITH M. GLASSER; SARAH CAWLEY SHARP,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief District Judge. (CA-96-337-A)

Submitted: September 15, 1998 Decided: August 12, 1999

Before NIEMEYER and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and HALL,* Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stephen A. Sharp, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

* Senior Judge Hall participated in the consideration of this case but died prior to the time the decision was filed. The decision is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

Stephen A. Sharp appeals a district court order dismissing his action for failure to comply with a district court order directing him to particularize his claims. Upon reviewing the record and the district court's opinion, we find the dismissal was proper. Sharp's allegations were repeated, rambling legalese and failed to contain a short, plain statement of the claims against each defendant. The district court gave him two opportunities to particularize his complaint and warned him that a failure to respond could result in dismissal. When Sharp's amended complaints did not cure the defects, the court entered an order of dismissal.

Because Sharp failed to particularize his deficient complaint in accordance with the court's orders, dismissal was proper. See Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95-96 (4th Cir. 1989). 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