UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

> No. 08-1724 (3:08-cv-00192-FDW)

Alfred T. Thomas,

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; PETER GILCREST; NATHANIEL P. PROCTOR; YVONNE MIMS-EVANS; THOMAS C. PORTER; HELMS, MULLIS & WICKER PLLC,

Defendants - Appellees

ORDER

Appellant has filed a renewed request to correct the case caption to use his full name rather than initials, in accordance with the captioning of the case in the district court. The Court grants the motion and re-captions this case as it was captioned in the district court.

The caption and party sections on the first page of the opinion are amended to identify the appellant by name. The references to appellant in the second and sixth lines on the second page of the opinion are amended to identify the appellant by name.

For the Court--By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor, Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1724

Alfred T. Thomas,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; PETER GILCREST; NATHANIEL P. PROCTOR; YVONNE MIMS-EVANS; THOMAS C. PORTER; HELMS, MULLIS & WICKER PLLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, District Judge. (3:08-cv-00192-FDW)

Submitted: November 10, 2008 Decided: December 9, 2008

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alfred T. Thomas, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Alfred T. Thomas appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2006). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. <u>Thomas v. United States</u>, No. 3:08-cv-00192-FDW (W.D.N.C. May 1, 2008). 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

2