UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-2053

RICHARD A. MILLER, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DEPARTMENT OF U.S. HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT; DRUCKER & FAULK, LLC; THETFORD PROPERTIES III, LIMITED PARTNERSHIP/THETFORD PROPERTY MANAGEMENT, INCORPORATED, Beaumont Avenue Apartments; RICHARD A. URBAN, Individually and as General Partner, Thetford Property Management, Incorporated; DIANE A. PICKETT, Individually and as Clerk of Court of Alamance County; TERRY JOHNSON, Individually and as Sheriff of Alamance County; WILLIAM K. BROWNLEE, Individually and as Counsel for Thetford Property Management, Incorporated; TAMMY EGGLESTON, Individually and as Property Manager of Beaumont Avenue Apartments; JAMES Individually and as ROBERSON, District Court Judge of Alamance County,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Chief District Judge. (1:05-cv-01045-NCT)

Submitted: January 3, 2007 Decided: February 6, 2007

Before WILLIAMS, MOTZ, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Richard A. Miller, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. Cheryl Thornton Sloan, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina; Grady L. Balentine, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; James Redfern Morgan, Jr., Christopher J. Geis, Robert T. Numbers, II, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina; Robert Lynn McClellan, IVEY, MCCLELLAN, GATTON & TALCOTT, LLP., Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Richard A. Miller, Sr. appeals the district court's order denying Miller's motion for a preliminary injunction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a), denying Miller's motion for defendants to bear the cost for service of summons pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(d), granting defendant Tammy Eggleston's motion to set aside entry of default judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(c), and granting all defendants' motions to dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Miller v. U.S. Dep't of Housing & Urban Dev., No. 1:05-cv-01045-NCT (M.D.N.C. Aug. 29, 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.

<u>AFFIRMED</u>