

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-2265

EMORY ALVIN MICHAU, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOAN W. WARDEN, Paralegal, Ninth Circuit Solicitor's Office, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; R. WESTMORELAND CLARKSON, Asst Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; DEBORAH RJ SHUPE, Asst Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; JOHN W. MCINTOSH, Asst Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; J. AL CANNON, Charleston County Sherriff's Office, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; PAMELA M. CRAWFORD, MD, Department of Mental Health, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; DANIEL T. STACEY, Attorney, Office of Appellate Defense, State of South Carolina, individually and officially; CLARON A. ROBERTSON, III, Attorney; JOHN DOES, South Carolina Department of Corrections individually and officially; JANE DOES, individually and officially,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:11-cv-00286-RMG)

Submitted: May 24, 2012

Decided: May 30, 2012

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Emory Alvin Michau, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Christopher Thomas Dorsel, SENN LEGAL, LLC, Charleston, South Carolina; Robin Lilley Jackson, Sandra Jane Senn, SENN, MCDONALD & LEINBACK, LLC, Charleston, South Carolina; Daniel L. Prenner, PRENNER MARVEL, PA, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Emory Alvin Michau, Jr., appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Michau v. Warden, No. 2:11-cv-00286-RMG (D.S.C. Oct. 17, 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