

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6440

EUGENE DOUGLAS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GARY D. MAYNARD, Secretary; DEPT. OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES; J. MICHAEL STOUFFER, Commissioner; MAJOR DOUGLAS CLOMAN; INTERNAL INVESTIGATION UNIT; WARDEN KATHLEEN S. GREEN; EASTERN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; ASS. WARDEN VICTORIA BURKHARD; MICHAEL KING, Chief of Security; CAPTAIN WALTER S. HOLMES; LT. D. BARNES; LT. SHEILA BROWN-KING; CAPTAIN C. TYLER; J. CHATHAM, Mailroom; SGT. PAUL ZIOLKOWSKI; OFFICER CHARLES WESTBROOK; LT. B. POLK; SGT. COPELAND; OFFICER D. CULLOTTA; SGT. GREGORY WARD; OFFICER COPE; OFFICER M. PARKER; OFFICER JONES; OFFICER CHRISTINA CARTER; SGT. BALDERSON; OFFICER BROMLEY; CORRECTIONAL MEDICAL SERVICE; DR. BAHANNA; CMS MEDICAL CONTRACTOR; MARYAM MESSAFORTH; OFFICER MCGEE; OFFICER STERLING; OFFICER MERRIT; OFFICER DAVIS; OFFICER GUNTER; OFFICER ASHBY; OFFICER SMITH; OFFICER WOOTEN; OFFICER TURNER; OFFICER WHITTINGTON; OFFICER BYRD; NURSE KATHY KILLMAN; NURSE KENYA; NURSE NIXEN; MARY COOPER; BRIAN BOZEMAN; OFFICER MISTER; OFFICER PERSINGER; OFFICER HARMON; OFFICER AHALT; OFFICER BAILY,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District Judge. (8:11-cv-00255-DKC)

Submitted: July 19, 2012

Decided: August 1, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eugene Douglas, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Judith Lane Weber, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Philip Melton Andrews, KRAMON & GRAHAM, PA, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eugene Douglas, Jr., appeals the district court's orders 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. Douglas v. Maynard, No. 8:11-cv-00255-DKC (D. Md. Feb. 9, Feb. 21, 2012). 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