

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-1329**

---

ROY SUDDUTH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRENDA VASQUEZ; CARMEN BONILLA; ROBERT C. KETTLER; MITCHELL MITCHELL; ZARRICK VENEY; HERNANDO RODRIQUEZ; GLEN WHITE; CRESTVIEW COMMONS, d/b/a Fields of Landmark; WILLIAM DEARMAN; ELIJAH JOHNSON; TERRENCE D. LANGFORD; CYNTHIA THOMPSON; KIMBERLY WADE; TALORI JOHNSON; ROY TRIESE; WILLIAM D. EUILLE; KSI MANAGEMENT INCORPORATED; SCOTT MANAGEMENT INCORPORATED; AMEURFINA BRAGA; MARCELO JORDAN; EVELYN GLEASON; HAROLD MANGOLD; JOHN P. ELLIS; RICHARD V. MINIONIS; NICOLE M. BACON; LEGAL SERVICES OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA; HOPE MAYFIELD; BARBARA DELANDER; MARGARET N. FRENCH; BECKY J. MOORE; DONALD M. HADDOCK, JR.; JEAN KELLEHER NIEBAUER; PAULA A. AVILA-GUILLEN; DAVID MILLER; STEVEN PRESTON; ROSS CONLAN; LEE A. PALMAN; ALEXANDRIA REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY; CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA; JOHN CATLETT; JANNINE PENNELL; ROBERT RODRIGUEZ; RUSSELL FURR; TIMOTHY LAWMASTER; CITY OF ALEXANDRIA OFFICE OF BUILDING AND FIRE CODE ADMINISTRATION; CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, OFFICE OF HUMAN RIGHTS; ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA GENERAL DISTRICT COURT; ALEXANDRIA SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:08-cv-01106-LMB-TCB)

---

Submitted: September 10, 2009

Decided: September 14, 2009

Before KING, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Roy Sudduth, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Roy Sudduth appeals the district court's order denying his motion to file an amended complaint and dismissing his civil action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Sudduth v. Vasquez, No. 1:08-cv-01106-LMB-TCB (E.D. Va. Mar. 18, 2009). 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