## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

WALTER D. BOOKER,  Plaintiff - Appellant,  v.  SGT. T. JOHNSON; TEC. E. STOVALL; OFC. JOHN BAGNELL,  Defendants - Appellees,  and  DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv
Plaintiff - Appellant,  v.  SGT. T. JOHNSON; TEC. E. STOVALL; OFC. JOHN BAGNELL,  Defendants - Appellees,  and  DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
v.  SGT. T. JOHNSON; TEC. E. STOVALL; OFC. JOHN BAGNELL,  Defendants - Appellees, and  DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
SGT. T. JOHNSON; TEC. E. STOVALL; OFC. JOHN BAGNELL,  Defendants - Appellees, and  DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
BAGNELL,  Defendants - Appellees, and  DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
and DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
DET. M. LUCK; DET. T. KEOUGH,  Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
Defendants.  Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
**
**
Submitted: March 29, 2018
Before AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Sen
Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Walter D. Booker, Appellant Pro Se. James Arthur Cales, III, FURNISS, DAVIS, RASHKIND & SAUNDERS, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Walter D. Booker appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Booker v. Johnson*, No. 1:14-cv-00833-JCC-TCB (E.D. Va. June 25, 2015; Sept. 8, 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**