

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7643

TITUS THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

OFFICER GERAGHTY; IMANI GREEN, Inmate #337-646; JESSE THOMAS, Inmate #340-968; JUSTIN CHANEY, Inmate #348-112; SERGEANT MIDDLETON,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 10-7666

TITUS THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SERGEANT MIDDLETON; OFFICER FRAS; OFFICER KENDALL; CAPTAIN WALLS (MCTC),

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 10-7764

TITUS THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SERGEANT HUFF; SERGEANT R. LIKIN; SERGEANT JOHN IHEOMA; P. KNIGHT, Case Manager; JESSE THOMAS, Inmate; DONALD FOSTER, Inmate; JUSTIN CHANEY, Inmate; WILLIAM COOL, Inmate; TERRY MILLER, Inmate,

Defendants - Appellees.

v.

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Party-in-Interest.

No. 11-6051

TITUS THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AJALA, Sgt.; A. YUSUT; HARRIS, Sgt.; AMAGHIONYEODIWE, Officer,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JUSTIN CHANEY, inmate #348-112; ANTONIO WATSON, inmate #336-897; TERRY MILLER, inmate #274-682; MARCUS SHANNON, inmate #281-148,

Defendants.

No. 11-6055

TITUS THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES TICHNELL, Case Management Supervisor; P. KNIGHT, Case Manager; LT. FRIEND,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:10-cv-01478-AW; 8:10-cv-01494-AW; 8:10-cv-02153-AW; 8:10-cv-02090-AW; 8:10-cv-02523-AW)

Submitted: February 28, 2011 Decided: March 9, 2011

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and KING and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Titus Thomas, Appellant Pro Se. Rex Schultz Gordon, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Titus Thomas challenges the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaints, denying reconsideration of those orders, and denying Thomas' motions to compel discovery and for the appointment of counsel. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Thomas v. Middleton, No. 8:10-cv-01478-AW (D. Md. Nov. 17 & Dec. 8, 2010); Thomas v. Middleton, No. 8:10-cv-01494-AW (D. Md. Nov. 17 & Dec. 8, 2010); Thomas v. Huff, No. 8:10-cv-02153-AW (D. Md. Dec. 8 & Dec. 29, 2010); Thomas v. Ajala, No. 8:10-cv-02090-AW (D. Md. Dec. 29, 2010); Thomas v. Tichnell, No. 8:10-cv-02523-AW (D. Md. Dec. 29, 2010). We further deny Thomas' motions for the appointment of counsel. 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