

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6585

WILBERT GILCHRIST,

Plaintiff- Appellant,

v.

DR. LARD,

Defendant – Appellee,

and

UNKNOWN; WENDALL PIXLEY, Warden, sued individually and in official capacity; INDER JEET SINGH GUJRAL, Dr., sued individually and in official capacity; JOHN DOE 1; J. EDWARDS, Nurse, sued individually and in official capacity; MAYHUE, Ms., sued individually and in official capacity; JANE DOE 1; TRACIE POARCH, Food Manager, sued individually and in official capacity; NATARCHA GREGG, Ms., sued individually and in official capacity; JEFFERY B. KISER, Warden; ROY CLARY, Assistant Warden; R. KELLY, Major; B. KELLY, Sgt.; JOHN SYKES, Unit Manager; Y. TAYLOR, IPM; BRIAN MITCHELL, Lt.; C. ARMES, Lt.; M. OLSIN, Food Director; DR. EDSON, Physician; E. WHITED, RNCB Medical; DR. ARMETTE, DOC Chief Physician; C. ST. JEAN, Nurse, sued individually and in official capacity; JOHN DOE 2, Dental Assistance, sued individually and in official capacity,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Roderick Charles Young, Magistrate Judge. (3:14-cv-00630-RCY)

Submitted: July 27, 2017

Decided: August 1, 2017

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Wilbert Gilchrist, Appellant Pro Se. Lisa H. Leiner, HARMAN CLAYTOR
CORRIGAN & WELLMAN, P.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Wilbert Gilchrist appeals the magistrate judge's* order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) action against Defendants. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge. *See Gilchrist v. Lard*, No. 3:14-cv-00630-RCY (E.D. Va. Mar. 31, 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

* The parties consented to proceed before a magistrate judge, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2012) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 73.