

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-7309

WARREN REGINALD STEVENSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RICHARD LANHAM, Commissioner; MUHAMMAD MOUBAREK, Dr.; JOSEPH SACCHET, Warden; JOHN DOE, Medical Company Employer; SERGEANT REED, #387; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER HUTZELL; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER WHARTON, II; LIEUTENANT STIPLE; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER MOATS, II; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER BOCHSTANZ II; CMS - CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SERVICE, Medical Company; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER GOSSARD; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER SIRBERT, II; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER HOLT, II; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER HAMMANN, II; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER HARRIS, II; SERGEANT LEONARD; SERGEANT WALLS; JOHN DOES, Correctional Officer II; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER OSBORNE, II, Housing Unit #5; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER ERNEWEIN, II, Housing Unit #5; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER BERRY, II, Housing Unit #5; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER II BADGE NO. 324; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER CLEVER, II; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER LEGGETT, II,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, District Judge. (CA-97-2564-MJG)

Submitted: February 11, 1999

Decided: February 23, 1999

Before ERVIN, NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Warren Reginald Stevenson, Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Glenn William Bell, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Philip Melton Andrews, John Augustine Bourgeois, KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Warren Reginald Stevenson appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1998) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Stevenson v. Lanham No. CA-97-2564-MJG (D. Md. Aug. 21, 1998). 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