

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-6094

WARREN CHASE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THE PRIOR AND PRESENT DOC COMMISSIONERS OF CORRECTIONS;
KATHLEEN GREEN, Warden; SIMON WAINWRIGHT, Warden; TYRONE
CROWDER; JOHN S. WOLFE; CALVIN WILSON; PATRICIA SHEARIN,
Warden; D. HANSEN, Major; C. N. PEAY, Major; J. MAYFIELD,
Lieutenant; T. DONNELL, Lieutenant; R. WALKER, Lieutenant;
J. E. PRICE, Sergeant; M. MONTGOMERY, Sergeant; T. MARTIN,
Sergeant; T. SMITH; T. BRAUNER, Sergeant; T. BROWN,
Sergeant; D. MAYZCK, Sergeant; R. THOMPSON, Sergeant; S.
FLOID; D. WIGGINS, Sergeant; K. COOPER, Sergeant; T.
RICHARDSON, Sergeant; H. TALIB, Sergeant; M. WINN, Sergeant;
E. THOMPSON, Sergeant; S. PHILLIPS, Sergeant; A. SCOTT,
Sergeant; D. GREEN, Sergeant; E. PULLEY, Sergeant; D.
MANGUM, Sergeant; M. ROSS, Sergeant; D. OLIVER, Sergeant; D.
CHASE, Sergeant; D. ALEXANDER, Sergeant; L. BATTLE,
Sergeant; F. SMITH, Sergeant; B. STOLKS, Sergeant; J. A.
BAILEY, Sergeant,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.
(1:08-cv-00834-CCB)

Submitted: March 29, 2010

Decided: April 9, 2010

Before MOTZ and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Warren Chase, Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Judith Lane Weber,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Warren Chase appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Chase's motion for injunctive relief and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Chase v. The Prior and Present DOC Commissioners, No. 1:08-cv-00834-CCB (D. Md. Dec. 2, 2009). We note Chase failed to indicate in his complaint that any specific Defendant acted with deliberate indifference to his serious needs. See Smith v. Ozmint, 578 F.3d 246, 255 (4th Cir. 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