Filed: 04/22/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 405431279

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-7671

KEVIN SNODGRASS, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

UHURU SEKOU OBATAIYE-ALLAH,

Plaintiff,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARK, Director, DOC; GERALD K. WASHINGTON, Regional Director; R. MATHENA, Warden; JOHN WALRATH, Assistant Warden; SHORTRIDGE, Operations Officer; GALLIHAR, Major; J. MCQUEEN, Investigator; CCS, Central Classification Services; SWINNEY, Unit Manager; KILBOURNE, Unit Manager; SERGEANT HALL, Sergeant; SERGEANT INGLE; L. T. MULLINS, Lieutenant; PAYNE, Lieutenant; J. MESSER, Grievance Coordinator; R. MULLINS, Grievance Coordinator; J. OWENS, Property; VANOVER, Property; I.H.O. L. MULLINS, Hearings Officer; SERGEANT SYKES, Sergeant; C/O R. BROWN; VANOVER; C/O CARTER; C/O MESSER; C/O OFFICER MESSER; C/O SHEPPARD; C/O DUPIE; C/O SLUSS; C/O AKERS; C/O JOHN DOES; JANE DOES; L. T. LAMBERT, Lieutenant; LIEUTENANT BLEVINS; LIEUTENANT LYLE; SERGEANT HILL; YOUNCE, Unit Manager; SERGEANT BARTON; SERGEANT MILLER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Chief District Judge. (7:14-cv-00257-GEC)

Submitted: April 13, 2015 Decided: April 22, 2015

Appeal: 14-7671 Doc: 17 Filed: 04/22/2015 Pg: 2 of 3

Before KING and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Snodgrass, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 14-7671 Doc: 17 Filed: 04/22/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Snodgrass, Jr., appeals the district court's orders (1) dismissing this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action without prejudice for failure to comply with a court order; and (2) denying his motions for reconsideration and appointment of counsel. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Snodgrass v. Clark, No. 7:14-cv-00257-GEC (W.D. Va. July 1 & Aug. 11, 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