

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-6833

P. MARK SHAFER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GREGORY I. SNOOK, President for Washington County Commissioners; PAULA PRICE, Washington County Adult Protective Services Agent; PAULA'S SUPERVISOR; CINDY DIAMOND, Esquire, Siskend, Grady, Rosen and Hoover Law Firm; STEVEN HOOVER, Hagerstown Police Department Detective; ARTHUR SMITH, Hagerstown Police Department Chief; JOE MICHAELS, Washington County Deputy State's Attorney; CHARLES STRONG, Washington County State's Attorney; DENNIS WEAVER, Washington County Clerk of Court - Circuit Court; STEPHEN SACKS, Esquire, Private Attorney; CARL CREEDEN, Washington County Public Defender; NANCY FORSTER, Maryland State Public Defender; CHRIS MCCABE, Secretary of Department of Human Resources; ANTHONY MCCANN, Secretary of Department of Health and Mental Hygiene; MELVIN HIRSHMAN, Bar Counsel for Attorney Grievance Commission - Maryland Bar; ROBERT EHRLICH, JR., Governor for the State of Maryland; STATE OF MARYLAND; WASHINGTON COUNTY, MARYLAND,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (8:06-cv-02222-PJM)

Submitted: July 31, 2008

Decided: August 4, 2008

Before NIEMEYER, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

P. Mark Shafer, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

P. Mark Shafer appeals the district court's order denying his second motion to reopen his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Shafer v. Snook, No. 8:06-cv-02222-PJM (D. Md. May 23, 2007). We deny Shafer's motions to amend his complaint, for appointment of counsel, and for oral argument, and we deny his request for production of documents and for mandamus relief. 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