

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1787

JUDY WHITE, a/k/a Judith Ayers White; GARY L. WHITE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

W. MACKELBURG, both personally and in his official capacity;
REX BLOCKER, both personally and in his official capacity;
V. KEPNER, both personally and in her official capacity; W.
ANDERSON, both personally and in his official capacity; FNU
CARTER, both personally and in her official capacity; V.
WILKINS, both personally and in her official capacity; M.
HUGER, both personally and in her official capacity; P.
MOREAU, both personally and in his official capacity; B.
INGRAM, both personally and in his official capacity;
EDGEFIELD FEDERAL PRISON; SOUTHEAST REGIONAL OFFICE OF THE
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, THE; FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS,
THE; DEFENDANTS THROUGH Z, continued from Defendants A:
relative to the events made the basis of the Plaintiffs'
Complaint, all of whom are unknown at the time of the filing
of the Plaintiffs' Complaint but will be added by amendment
when ascertained; DEFENDANTS A, being those persons or
entities that participated in any manner whatsoever and/or
conspired in any manner whatsoever, whether directly or
indirectly, regardless of knowledge beforehand, in any act or
omission - Continued under Defendants through Z; M.
MITCHELL, both personally and in her official capacity; R.
KELSO, both personally and in her official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

M. MILLER, both personally and in her official capacity; FNU
KELSO, both personally and in his official capacity,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (8:11-cv-00144-HMH)

Submitted: December 20, 2011 Decided: December 22, 2011

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Judy White and Gary White, Appellants Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Judy and Gary White appeal the district court's orders accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying emergency relief, dismissing without prejudice their civil complaint for failure to prosecute under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41, and denying reconsideration. We review a district court's dismissal under Rule 41(b) for abuse of discretion. Ballard v. Carlson, 882 F.2d 93, 95-96 (4th Cir. 1989). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. White v. Mackelburg, No. 8:11-cv-00144-HMH (D.S.C. March 29, 2011; May 10, 2011; May 26, 2011; June 20, 2011; July 6, 2011).^{*} 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

^{*} To the extent that the Whites appeal the denial of temporary restraining orders, such orders are generally not appealable. See Virginia v. Tenneco, Inc., 538 F.2d 1026, 1029-30 (4th Cir. 1976). We therefore dismiss the appeal insofar as they are appealing the denial of temporary restraining orders.