UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1955

YANNE VENIERIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FAMILY LIVING INSTITUTE,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1963

YANNE VENIERIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ROBERT WITTMAN,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1964

YANNE VENIERIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1965

YANNE VENIERIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

RIVERSIDE BEHAVIORAL,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1967

YANNE VENIERIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BARACK HUSSEIN OBAMA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 09-1979

YANNE VENIERIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BARACK OBAMA, President,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith, District Judge. (4:09-cv-00103-RBS-TEM; 4:09-cv-00101-RBS-TEM; 4:09-cv-00095-RBS-TEM; 4:09-cv-00102-RBS-TEM; 4:09-cv-00100-RBS-TEM; 4:09-cv-00098-RBS-TEM)

Submitted: November 19, 2009 Decided: December 1, 2009

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yanne Venieris, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yanne Venieris appeals the district court's orders dismissing his six civil suits as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) (2006). We have reviewed the records in these cases and find that Venieris' appeals are frivolous. Accordingly, we dismiss the appeals for the reasons stated by the district court. Venieris v. Family Living Inst., No. 4:09cv-00103-RBS-TEM (E.D. Va. Aug. 14, 2009); Venieris v. Wittman, No. 4:09-cv-00101-RBS-TEM (E.D. Va. Aug. 17, 2009); Venieris v. Drug Enforcement Agency, No. 4:09-cv-00095-RBS-TEM (E.D. Va. Aug. 17, 2009); Venieris v. Riverside Behavioral, No. 4:09-cv-00102-RBS-TEM (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 14, 2009 & entered Aug. 17, 2009); Venieris v. Obama, No. 4:09-cv-00100-RBS-TEM (E.D. Va. August 17, 2009); Venieris v. Obama, No. 4:09-cv-00098-RBS-TEM (E.D. Va. August 17, 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.

DISMISSED