Bernard Richardson v. Dulane
Appeal: 16-6906 Doc: 19 Filed: 06/01/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF AF	PEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCU	IT

No. 16-6906

BERNARD RAY RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

Defendants - Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

v.

DOCTOR DULANES; N. STANFORD, Head Nurse W.R.S.P.; LESLIE J. FLEMING, Warden W.R.S.P.; B. R. RAVIZEE, Grievance Coordinator W.R.S.P.; R. H. BIVENS, Grievance Coordinator Western Regional Administrator Office; C. L. PARR, Grievance Coordinator Western Regional Administrator Office; NURSE BLEDSOE, W.R.S.P.; H. C. RAY, Virginia Department of Corrections Director of Health Services; NAME UNKNOWN, Va D.O.C. Director of Health Services,

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:16-cv-00356-JCC-TCB)

Submitted: May 18, 2017

Decided: June 1, 2017

Before DUNCAN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bernard Ray Richardson, Appellant Pro Se.

Appeal: 16-6906 Doc: 19 Filed: 06/01/2017 Pg: 2 of 2

PER CURIAM:

Bernard Ray Richardson appeals from the district court's orders denying his request to proceed without prepayment of the filing fee and denying his motion for reconsideration. The district court found that Richardson did not make a sufficient showing that he was under imminent danger of serious physical injury and dismissed his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) (2012). We have reviewed the record, including the dismissal orders identified as qualifying strikes pursuant to § 1915(g), and find no reversible error. Accordingly, while we grant leave to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Richardson v. Dulanes*, No. 1:16-cv-00356-JCC-TCB (E.D. Va. Apr. 12, 2016 & June 1, 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