

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2121

CHRISTOPHER A. ODOM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; JASON KING, Public Defender; CHARLES PATRICK, Solicitor; JUDGE MULLINS; SOUTH CAROLINA BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD; JUDGE JAMES GOSNELL; MAYOR JOE RILEY, City of Charleston; GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY; MAYOR KEITH SUMNEY, North Charleston; JUDGE GARFINKEL; JUDGE KRISTI HARRINGTON; JUDGE JEFFERSON; STATE ATTORNEY ALAN WILSON; P.D. ASHLEY PENNINGTON; PROSECUTOR SCARLETT WILSON; MICHAEL GRANT; MUSC; DOLLAR TREE; CARTA BUS CO.; CARTA BUS WHEELCHAIR LIFT MANUFACTURER; CARTA BUS INSURER; CARTA BUS DRIVER; OFFICER CHERRY, of Charleston Police Dep't; OFFICER HO, of Charleston Police Dep't; UNKNOWN POLICE OFFICER, with Officer Ho on Dec. 16, 2014; OFFICER TUGYA, of Charleston Police Dep't; CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF NORTH CHARLESTON POLICE DEPARTMENT; CITY OF CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA TAXPAYERS; COUNTY OF CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; CITY OF NORTH CHARLESTON TAXPAYERS; FNU LNU, Female Victim Advocate; DR. STEPHANIE MONTGOMERY; CHAMPUS, Insurer; FNU LNU, Doctors from MUSC who approved placement of Plaintiff in SCDMH,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Richard M. Gergel, District Judge. (5:16-cv-02674-RMG)

Submitted: January 27, 2017

Decided: February 16, 2017

Before NIEMEYER and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher A. Odom, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher A. Odom appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation, dismissing Odom's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (2012), and imposing a pre-filing injunction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in formal pauperis and dismiss the appeal for the reasons stated by the district court. Odom v. South Carolina, No. 5:16-cv-02674-RMG (D.S.C. Sept. 15, 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.

DISMISSED