

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7329

TYRONE LAMAR ROBERSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

ANTHONY J. PADULA, Warden Lee Corrections Institution; LIEUTENANT A. DAVIS; MS. FULTON, Medical Health Care Provider RN; RN MS. JUDY RABON; RN MS. MCDONALD; J. MCREE, MD, KCI Pharmacy; JUANITA MOSS, Food Service Supervisor; MS. BELL, Food Service Supervisor; MS. NORMAN, Food Service Supervisor; MS. ANDERSON, Food Service Supervisor,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; MAJOR JAMES DEAN; LIEUTENANT ERNEST MIMS; SERGEANT B. COOK; SERGEANT K. ARENS; MS. KELA E. THOMAS, Commission of Probation Parole and Pardon Services Director; WILLIAM BYARS, JR., SCDC Director, et al; SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD COMMITTEE; WILLIAM F. MARSCHER, III, SC Commission on Indigent Defense; FREDERICK M. CORLEY, Esquire; RANDOLPH MURDAUGH, III, Solicitor Attorney for the State; WILLIAM T. HOWELL, Judge of the 14th Judicial Circuit Court of SC,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:13-cv-01872-RMG)

Submitted: March 29, 2016

Decided: March 31, 2016

Before GREGORY and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tyrone Lamar Roberson, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph Parker McLean, CLARKE, JOHNSON, PETERSON & MCLEAN, PA, Florence, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tyrone Lamar Roberson appeals the district court's order adopting the report and 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. Roberson v. Padula, No. 2:13-cv-01872-RMG (D.S.C. July 22, 2015). In addition, we decline to address claims raised for the first time on appeal. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993). 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