Doc. 406013198

Joel Vicars v. Harold Clarke Appeal: 15-7546 Doc: 13 Filed: 06/03/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7546

JOEL VICARS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director of the Virginia Department of Corrections (VDOC); A. DAVID ROBINSON, Chief of Corrections Operations of the VDOC; JOHN JABE, Deputy Director of Operations of the VDOC; GREGORY HOLLOWAY, Superintendent/Warden of Wallens Ridge State Prison; DAVID ZOOK, Assistant Warden of Wallens Ridge State Prison; REBECCA YOUNG, Operations Manager/Officer at Wallens Ridge State Prison; W. TODD FARRIS, Unit Manager at Wallens Ridge State Prison; DENNIS COLLINS, Unit Manager at Wallens Ridge State Prison; QUINCEY REYNOLDS, Unit Manager of the 864.1 VHU at Wallens Ridge State Prison; BRENDA RAVIZEE, Institutional Ombudsman/Grievance Coordinator at Wallens Ridge State Prison,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Norman K. Moon, Senior District Judge. (7:15-cv-00620-NKM-RSB)

Submitted: May 13, 2016 Decided: June 3, 2016

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dockets.Justia.com

Appeal: 15-7546 Doc: 13 Filed: 06/03/2016 Pg: 2 of 3

Joel Vicars, Appellant Pro Se. John Michael Parsons, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 15-7546 Doc: 13 Filed: 06/03/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

## PER CURIAM:

Joel Vicars appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Defendants on his complaint asserting claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) and the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc to 2000cc-5 (2012). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Vicars v. Clarke, No. 7:14-cv-00620-NKM-RSB (W.D. Va. Aug. 26, 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