

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-7559

NATHANIEL DANTE RICE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TRACY SMITH, Officer; GLEN W. GRAHAM, Officer;
ANTONIOVILLALOBOS, Officer; Individually and in Their
OfficialCapacities; LOCAL GOVERNMENT EXCESS LIABILITY FUND,
INCORPORATED OF GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SHERIFF B. J. BARNES,

Defendant.

No. 07-7682

NATHANIEL DANTE RICE,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRACY SMITH, Officer; ANTONIO VILLALOBOS, Officer; LOCAL
GOVERNMENT EXCESS LIABILITY FUND, INCORPORATED OF GREENSBORO,
NORTH CAROLINA; GLEN W. GRAHAM, Officer,

Defendants - Appellants,

and

B. J. BARNES,

Defendant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, Jr., District Judge. (1:05-cv-00434-WLO-PTS)

Submitted: April 17, 2008

Decided: April 21, 2008

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nathaniel Dante Rice, Appellant/Appellee Pro Se. James Antone Dickens, Jr., COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Greensboro, North Carolina; Matthew L. Mason, GUILFORD COUNTY SHERIFF'S ATTORNEY, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellees/Appellants.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In appeal number 07-7559, Nathaniel Dante Rice appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint and its order denying reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Rice v. Smith, No. 1:05-cv-00434-WLO-PTS (M.D.N.C. Sept. 14, 2007; Oct. 29, 2007). We deny Rice's motions for appointment of counsel.

In appeal number 07-7682, defendants below appeal the district court's order affirming the magistrate judge's order denying their motion to strike certain documents filed by Rice. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm. We deny Rice's motion for 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