## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-6815

SHAHEEN CABBAGESTALK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MS. BLOWE; OFFICER K. BROWN; NURSE MS. SULLIVAN; NURSE MS. LIEUTENANT LANCASTEIN; SERGEANT DAVID MERRITTS; SERGEANT GARY MANIGAULT; OFFICER MICHAEL LAWRENCE; CORPORAL SMALLS; OFFICER JAMES JOHNSON; LIEUTENANT THOMPSON; OFFICER RICHARD ALLEN; OFFICER MONIQUE STEWART; CAPTAIN NUMMALLEY; DOCTOR BABB; NURSE AUSTIN; ASST. WARDEN BODISON; MR. REEVES, Food Supervisor; MS. WALKER, Mailroom Lady; SERGEANT MS. PERRY; MS. JENKINS, Grievance Coordinator; LIEUTENANT KING; OFFICER CHARLES RODGERS; SERGEANT VONMITIUS; OFFICER PALMER; LIEUTENANT WILLIAMS; OFFICER COX; CORPORAL SMITH; SERGEANT MEYERS; OFFICER WILLIAMS; SERGEANT ELMO; SERGEANT JONES; OFFICER ARANDA; OFFICER GOODWIN; CORPORAL SELBY; OFFICER SIMMONS; OFFICER MCDONALD; SERGEANT STRADFORD; SERGEANT JEFFERSON; SERGEANT TERRANCE FORDE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Sol Blatt, Jr., Senior District Judge. (3:08-cv-01639-SB)

Submitted: October 23, 2009 Decided: November 19, 2009

Before MICHAEL, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Shaheen Cabbagestalk, Appellant Pro Se. William J. Thrower, STUCKEY LAW OFFICES, PA, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Shaheen Cabbagestalk appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action for failure to prosecute under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Cabbagestalk v. Blowe, No. 3:08-cv-01639-SB (D.S.C. Feb. 27, 2009). We deny Cabbagestalk's motion for summary judgment. 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