

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1627

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, II., and a "Minor J.F.D" as next best friend,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, "Pat McCorry" individually and as Governor; WAKE COUNTY N.C., DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, "Ramon Rojano" individually and as Director; WAKE COUNTY N.C., FAMILY COURT, "Donald Steven" Chief Superior Court Judge 10th Judicial District of Wake County North Carolina individually and in his official capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 13-1715

WILLIAM SCOTT DAVIS, II, and a "Minor J.F.D" as next best friend,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, "Pat McCorry" individually and as Governor; WAKE COUNTY N.C., DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, "Ramon Rojano" individually and as Director; WAKE COUNTY N.C., FAMILY COURT, "Donald Steven" Chief Superior Court Judge, 10th Judicial District of Wake County North Carolina, individually and in his official capacities,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief District Judge. (4:13-cv-00055-RBS-DEM)

Submitted: July 18, 2013

Decided: July 22, 2013

Before WILKINSON, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William Scott Davis, II, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Scott Davis, II, appeals the district court's order dismissing his "Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and Emergency Motion for Return of Child Under 28 U.S.C. § 2241-2254" pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2) (2006). Davis also appeals the district court's orders denying his motion to appoint counsel and motion to stay. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Davis v. North Carolina, No. 4:13-cv-00055-RBS-DEM (E.D. Va. May 6, 2013; May 14, 2013). We deny Davis' motions to appoint counsel. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED