

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1368

JOHN M. DICKSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

FBI NEWPORT NEWS FIELD OFFICE, JOHN/JANE DOE(S), TECHNICAL AGENT(S), acting as a person(s) and member(s) of a criminal enterprise under The (RICO) Act of Title 18 U.S. Code 1962; CITY OF HAMPTON VIRGINIA POLICE DIVISION'S HOMELAND SECURITY UNIT, TECHNICAL POLICE OFFICER(S) JOHN/JANE DOE(S), acting as a person(s) and member(s) of a criminal enterprise under The (RICO) Act of Title 18 U.S. Code 1962; CITY OF NEWPORT NEWS VIRGINIA POLICE DEPARTMENT, TECHNICAL POLICE OFFICER(S) JOHN/JANE DOE(S), acting as a person and member of a criminal enterprise under The (RICO) Act of Title 18 U.S. Code 1962; HAMPTON ROADS REGIONAL JAIL AUTHORITY, acting as a person and member of a criminal enterprise under The (RICO) Act of Title 18 U.S. Code 1962; ATTORNEY S. LAWRENCE DUMVILLE OF NORRIS, ST. CLAIR & LOTKIN ATTORNEYS AT LAW, acting as a person and member of a criminal enterprise under The (RICO) Act of Title 18 U.S. Code 1962; ATTORNEY KENNETH W. ABRAMS, OF MCGUIRE WOODS LLP, acting as a person and member of a criminal enterprise under The (RICO) Act of Title 18 U.S. Code 1962,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Newport News. Arenda L. Wright Allen, District Judge. (4:15-cv-00124-AWA-DEM)

Submitted: August 25, 2016

Decided: August 29, 2016

Before NIEMEYER, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John M. Dickson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

John M. Dickson, Jr., appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil complaint as untimely and for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted pursuant to 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. Dickson v. FBI Newport News Field Office, No. 4:15-cv-00124-AWA-DEM (E.D. Va. Mar. 2, 2016). 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