

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7111

FREDRICK Y. CULP, a/k/a Fredrick Yvonne Culp,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DOCTOR ALEWINE, South Carolina Department of Corrections;
DOCTOR JOHN PATE, Doctor at Lee Correctional Institution;
DOCTOR AMONITTI, Doctor at Ridgeland Correctional
Institution; YVONNE MCDONALD, Nurse at Lee; MICHELLE
USSEMY, Nurse at Kershaw Correctional Institution; PAUL
DRAGO, Nurse Practitioner at Kershaw; NURSE DAVIS, at
Ridgeland,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; RICHLAND
MEMORIAL, Palmetto Health Richland Hospital; DOCTORS AT
RICHLAND MEMORIAL THAT PERFORMED HEART SURGERY; NURSE
PRACTITIONER AT LEE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; NURSE
PRACTITIONER AT RIDGELAND CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; DOCTOR
PETITE, at Richland Memorial; DOCTOR BEARDEN, at Richland
Memorial; DOCTOR JOHN DOE, at Richland Memorial; DOCTOR AT
LEE CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION; DOCTOR AT RIDGELAND
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr.,
District Judge. (5:13-cv-01342-JFA)

Submitted: October 16, 2014

Decided: October 22, 2014

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Frederick Y. Culp, Appellant Pro Se. Samuel F. Arthur, III, James Rufus Bratton, III, AIKEN, BRIDGES, NUNN, ELLIOTT & TYLER, PA, Florence, South Carolina; Meghan Hazelwood Hall, Julius Walker McKay, II, Kelli Lister Sullivan, MCKAY, CAUTHEN, SETTANA & STUBLEY, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Frederick Y. Culp appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Culp v. Doctor Alewine, No. 5:13-cv-01342-JFA (D.S.C. July 14, 2014). 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