Filed: 09/09/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2536

TINA M. GRACE; LARRY GRACE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

C. MICHAEL SPARKS; MICHAEL THORNSBURY,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JAY LOCKARD, individually and in their (former) official capacity; THE WEST VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS; STEVEN D. CANTERBURY, its administrator; THE MINGO COUNTY COMMISSION, together with its present (and former) commissioner(s) and in their (his) official capacity; GREG SMITH; JOHN MARK HUBBARD; DIANE HANNAH; DAVID L. BAISDEN; MINGO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. John T. Copenhaver, Jr., District Judge. (2:15-cv-01505)

Submitted: August 31, 2016 Decided: September 9, 2016

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and WILKINSON and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dockets.Justia.com

Doc. 406189486

Appeal: 15-2536 Doc: 31 Filed: 09/09/2016 Pg: 2 of 3

Richard A. Robb, South Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellants. Philip B. Sword, William R. Slicer, Michael D. Dunham, SHUMAN, MCCUSKEY & SLICER, PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia; Gary E. Pullin, Emily L. Lilly, PULLIN, FOWLER, FLANAGAN, BROWN & POE, PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 15-2536 Doc: 31 Filed: 09/09/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Appellants Tina and Larry Grace appeal the district court's order denying relief on their 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. Specifically, the Graces challenge the district court's dismissal of the claims against appellees C. Michael Sparks and Michael Thornsbury. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Grace v. Sparks, No. 2:15-cv-01505 (S.D. W. Va. Nov. 19, 2015 & July 25, 2016); see Stump v. Sparkman, 435 U.S. 349, 356-57 (1978); Imbler v. Pachtman, 424 U.S. 409, 430-31 (1976). 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