

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1549

CARL E. MCADOO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, (Department of Veterans Affairs) in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; DR. ERNEST T. AHL, JR., in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; DR. SONNY W. TUCKER, JR., in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; SANDY F. PIERCE, Physician Assistant, in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; RUTHERFORD COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES, in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; JOHN CARROLL, in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; VIC MARTIN, in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; ANN PADGETT, in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally; JOYCE ANN NASH, in Official and Personal Capacity, sued Jointly and Severally,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Max O. Cogburn, Jr., District Judge. (1:14-cv-00239-MOC-DLH)

Submitted: August 24, 2017

Decided: August 28, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carl E. McAdoo, Appellant Pro Se. Gill Paul Beck, Sr., Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina; Sean Francis Perrin, WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina; John E. Rogers, II, WARD LAW FIRM, PA, Spartanburg, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Carl E. McAdoo appeals from the district court's orders granting the Defendants' motions to dismiss his complaint alleging various civil rights violations related to the death and estate of his father. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *McAdoo v. United States*, No. 1:14-cv-00239-MOC-DLH (W.D.N.C. Aug. 12, 2015; Apr. 4, 2017). 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