

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-6575**

---

OMORO RAGLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

H. R. POWELL; W. W. PIXLEY; W. F. SEAL; W.  
THORNE; R. M. HEDGEPEETH; LIEUTENANT BARNES;  
LIEUTENANT SMITH; CORRECTIONAL OFFICER BOONE;  
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER PRYOR; MS. TANN; RONALD  
J. ANGELONE; GENE JOHNSON; R. FLEMING; J. LEE;  
D. HAMMOND; R. A. YOUNG; L. W. JARVIS; F.  
LOCKHART; K. A. POLINSKY; V. J. BANDY; GERALD  
K. WASHINGTON; B. BOOKER; LIEUTENANT EDMONDS;  
MS. HARRISON; L. W. HUFFMAN; J. BOONE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, Senior District  
Judge. (7:02-cv-00786-jct)

---

Submitted: July 25, 2006

Decided: August 2, 2006

---

Before WILLIAMS, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Omore Ragland, Appellant Pro Se. Pamela Anne Sargent, Assistant  
Attorney General, Joel Christopher Hoppe, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Omore Ragland appeals from the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Defendants in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action challenging, among other things, the validity and enforcement of the prison's grooming policy. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Ragland v. Powell, No. 7:02-cv-00786-jct (W.D. Va. filed Mar. 14 & entered Mar. 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