

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1499

JUNE BRYANT-BUNCH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT;
WANDIE VINCENT, Sheriff; DETECTIVE REED;
DEPUTY PARKER; JANE DOE, Deputy; MAGISTRATE
SHEARN; BOYD BENNETT, Director of Prisons;
LAWRENCE SOLOMON; NEAL VAUGHAN; C. A. COLEMAN,
Lieutenant; LIEUTENANT POWELL; OFFICER MASON;
OFFICER PHILLIPS; OFFICER ARCHER,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-1765

JUNE BRYANT-BUNCH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT;
WANDIE VINCENT, Sheriff; DETECTIVE REED;
DEPUTY PARKER; JANE DOE, Deputy; BOYD BENNETT,
Director of Prisons; LAWRENCE SOLOMON; NEAL
VAUGHAN; C. A. COLEMAN, Lieutenant; LIEUTENANT
POWELL; OFFICER MASON; OFFICER PHILLIPS;
OFFICER ARCHER,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MAGISTRATE SHEARN,

Defendant.

Appeals from the United States District Courts for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Elizabeth City and Raleigh. James C. Dever III, District Judge. (2:05-cv-00034-D)

Submitted: November 15, 2006

Decided: November 17, 2006

Before WIDENER, WILKINSON, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

June Bryant-Bunch, Appellant Pro Se. Charles J. Vaughan, Woodland, North Carolina; Grady L. Balentine, James Philip Allen, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; James Redfern Morgan, Jr., Robert T. Numbers, II, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, June Bryant-Bunch appeals the district court's orders granting Appellee Shearn's motion to dismiss and granting the remaining Appellees' motion to dismiss her 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action 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 Bryant-Bunch v. Northampton County Sheriff's Dep't, No. 2:05-cv-00034-D (E.D.N.C. Apr. 7, 2006 & June 15, 2006). 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