

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-6117

STEVEN WAYNE GOODMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

HARRY L. CARRICO, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Virginia, individually and in his official capacity; P. CLARKE KATTENBURG, P.C., individually and in his official capacity; WILLIAM D. PICKETT, individually and in his official capacity; THOMAS A. EDMONDS, Virginia State Bar, individually and in his official capacity; NOEL D. SENDEL, individually and in her official capacity; ROBERT BROOKS ALTIZER, individually and in his official capacity; JAMES A. BUTTS, III, individually and in his official capacity; JOHN A.C. KEITH, individually and in his official capacity; EDWARD B. LOWRY, individually and in his official capacity; WILLIAM G. MURRAY, individually and in his official capacity; W. SCOTT STREET, III, individually and in his official capacity; SHARON MAITLAND MOON, individually and in her official capacity; GEORGE ALLEN, Governor, individually and in his official capacity; JAMES F. ALMAND, individually and in his official capacity; EDWARD M. HOLLAND, individually and in his official capacity; JAMES GILMORE, Attorney General, individually and in his official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior District Judge. (CA-97-391-3)

Submitted: November 5, 1998

Decided: November 19, 1998

Before ERVIN, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Steven Wayne Goodman, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Steven Wayne Goodman, a Virginia inmate, appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1998) complaint under 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915A (West Supp. 1998). We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and find that this appeal is frivolous. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. Goodman v. Carrico, No. CA-97-391-3 (E.D. Va. Dec. 30, 1997). Although not explicitly addressed by the district court, Goodman's First Amendment claim was also properly dismissed as frivolous. We deny Appellant's motions for appointment of counsel and to remand case and 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.

DISMISSED