UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6216

ERIC CHILDRESS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

M. PETTIFORD, FCI Bennettsville Warden in his individual and official capacity; ASSISTANT WARDEN SMITH; ASSISTANT WARDEN MASACONI; DENISE BAWLING, Captain, in her individual and official capacity; D. SCHANTZ, SHU Lieutenant, in his individual and official capacity; L. MILLER, Lieutenant, in his individual and official capacity; D. MOORE, Lieutenant Sr. Officer, in his individual and official capacity; LUIS BERRIAS, Doctor, in his individual and official capacity; JULIA BERRIAS, Doctor, in her individual and official capacity; H. HANSEN, Nurse, in her individual and official capacity; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER CASH, in his individual and official capacity; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER YOUNG, in his individual and official capacity; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER capacity; DOUGLAS, in his individual and official CORRECTIONAL OFFICER JONES, in his individual and official capacity; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER CARTWRIGHT, in his individual and official capacity; J. STREEVAL, in his individual and official capacity; CASE MANAGER STREAMER, in his individual and official capacity; COUNSELOR LEWIS, in his individual and official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Sol Blatt, Jr., Senior District Judge. (4:08-cv-01001-SB)

Submitted: August 19, 2010

Decided: August 27, 2010

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Childress, Appellant Pro Se. Barbara Murcier Bowens, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eric Childress appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. <u>Childress v. Pettiford</u>, No. 4:08-cv-01001-SB (D.S.C. Jan. 27, 2010). 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

3