

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-6700**

---

EMMANUEL E. SEWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

J. MICHAEL STOUFFER; BOBBY P. SHEARIN; RICHARD R. GRAHAM;  
LIEUTENANT J. L. HARBAUGH; LIEUTENANT D. DURST; LIEUTENANT  
YACHENCH; LIEUTENANT HAGGARD; SERGEANT SIMMONS; SERGEANT R.  
R. SHANK; SERGEANT R. H. LIPHOLD, JR.; SERGEANT LANCASTER;  
SERGEANT G. B. MCALPINE; SERGEANT M. BULGER; SERGEANT D. L.  
SMITH; SERGEANT MCKENZIE; L. GIRVIN, CO II; P. DEIST, CO II;  
J. A. FRIEND, CO II; R. KEEFER, CO II; J. W. PRITTS, CO II;  
KISNER, CO II; R. R. HOLLINS, CO II; T. A. MELLOTT, CO II;  
KENNELL, J.A., CO II; PETERS, CO II; KALBAUGH; M. HUBNER;  
SMITH; JODI STOUFFER; TINA M. GERAGHTY; SUSIE CUNNINGHAM;  
SHARON BAUCOM; MARY JOE SABETTELLI; DR. BEN OTEYZA; DR.  
MAJID ARNAOUT; P.A. GREG FLURY; NURSE STEVE BRAY; NURSE  
AFRICA; NURSE CHRISTINA B.; NURSE JANICE GILMORE; DR. JAMES  
HOLWAGER; SHERRY HEFFERCAMP; LAURA MOULDEN; OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WARDEN; STEPHEN Z. MEEHAN; JOSEPH B. TETRAULT; PAULINE K.  
WHITE,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District  
Judge. (8:11-cv-00614-DKC)

---

Submitted: October 15, 2012

Decided: October 30, 2012

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Emmanuel E. Sewell, Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Judith Lane-  
Weber, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland; Philip  
Melton Andrews, Ryan Alexander Mitchell, KRAMON & GRAHAM, PA,  
Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Emmanuel E. Sewell 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 affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Sewell v. Stouffer, No. 8:11-cv-00614-DKC (D. Md. Mar. 9, 2012). We deny Sewell's pending motions. 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