UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_	No. 21-6651		
RICHARD L. DAVIDSON,			
Plaintiff - App	ellant,		
v.			
HEARINGS OFFICER FRANKS WARDEN CARL A. MANIS, Wa JOHN DOE, employed by Virginia	llens Ridge State Pr	rison; MARCU	
Defendants - A	appellees.		
Appeal from the United States Di Roanoke. Thomas T. Cullen, Distri – Submitted: November 12, 2021		00169-TTC-R	•
Before RICHARDSON and QUAT Circuit Judge.	TTLEBAUM, Circui		,
Affirmed by unpublished per curian	n opinion.		
Richard L. Davidson, Appellant Pro -	Se.		

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Richard L. Davidson appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. We conclude that Davidson was not denied due process at his disciplinary hearing, and the hearings officer's decision was supported by some evidence. See Superintendent, Mass. Corr. Inst., Walpole v. Hill, 472 U.S. 445, 454 (1985) (describing court's review of evidence in disciplinary hearings); Lennear v. Wilson, 937 F.3d 257, 268 (4th Cir. 2019) (stating due process requirements at disciplinary hearings). We further conclude that Davidson failed to exhaust his retaliatory-transfer claim by not using the Offender Grievance Procedure. See Woodford v. Ngo, 548 U.S. 81, 85-93 (2006) (describing exhaustion requirements). Lastly, we conclude that Davidson was not prejudiced by the court's omission in not ruling on his request for a transcript of the audio recording of the disciplinary hearing at his expense. Strag v. Bd. of Trs., 55 F.3d 943, 954 (4th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, we affirm. 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