

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-1063

KENDALL H. BREEDLOVE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SKY BRYCE ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED; L. E.
HOOLE; DENISE F. BARB; COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGIN-
IA; JOHN #1 DOE, and other defendants unknown
at present,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 98-1064

KENDALL H. BREEDLOVE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES J. MIHALIK, In his capacity as President
of the Sky Bryce Association, Incorporated,
and in his individual capacity; SKY BRYCE
ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED; JOHN DOE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. James H. Michael, Jr., Senior District Judge. (CA-97-41-H, CA-95-55-H)

Submitted: July 2, 1998

Decided: July 21, 1998

Before NIEMEYER and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges, and HALL, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kendall H. Breedlove, Appellant Pro Se. James Van Ingold, CHADWICK, WASHINGTON, OLTERS, MORIARTY & LYNN, P.C., Fairfax, Virginia; Mark Dudley Obenshain, WHARTON, ALDHIZER & WEAVER, Harrisonburg, Virginia; Richard Cullen, Gregory E. Lucyk, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, 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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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 denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1998) complaint and motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the records and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Breedlove v. Sky Bryce Assoc., Inc., No. CA-97-41-H (W.D. Va. Nov. 13 & Dec. 12, 1997); Breedlove v. Mihalik, No. CA-95-55-H (W.D. Va. July 1, 1996; Dec. 12, 1997). We deny Appellant's "motion for certification" and "Sworn Motion for the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to Cause the Correction and the Certification of Each of the False, Tampered, Incomplete, Uncertified Records on Appeal from the Federal District Court, in each of the Two Instant Appeals." 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