

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-6913**

---

JESUS EMMANUEL JEHOVAH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MR. HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director; MR. A. DAVID ROBINSON, Deputy Director; WILLIAM "BUCK" ROGERS, Deputy Director; MR. JOHN WOODSON, Warden - Augusta Correctional Center; MR. DARELL MILLER, Assistant Warden - Augusta Correctional Center; MS. LYNN GRAHAM, Operations Manager - Augusta Correctional Center; MS. TRACY LAWHORN, Institutional Program Manager - Augusta Correctional Center; RICHARD ATKINS, Law Librarian - Augusta Correctional Center; CAROLINE DULL, Accountant - Augusta Correctional Center; MS. JUNE MILLER, Accountant - Augusta Correctional Center; MS. B. WILHELM, Account Clerk - Augusta Correctional Center; MR. C. BYRD, Sergeant - Sussex II State Prison; MS. TURNER, Corporal - Sussex II State Prison; OFFICER X, Sussex II State Prison; OFFICER Y, Sussex II State Prison; OFFICER Z, Sussex II State Prison; MR. HARRIS L. DIGGS, Warden - Deep Meadow Correctional Center; MS. CHRISLEY, Sergeant - Deep Meadow Correctional Center; MS. SEAY, Ombudsman/Law Librarian - Deep Meadow Correctional Center; MRS. JOYCE A. ANTONIO,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James P. Jones, District Judge. (7:14-cv-00538-JPJ-RSB)

---

Submitted: December 17, 2015

Decided: December 21, 2015

---

Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jesus Emmanuel Jehovah, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jesus Jehovah Emmanuel appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2012). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Jehovah v. Clarke, No. 7:14-cv-00538-JPJ-RSB (W.D. Va. May 11, 2015). 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