

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6741

STUART WAYNE TOMPKINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION; J. N. VAUGHAN; OFFICER HUNT; BILL CARROL; OFFICER BARBER; SERGEANT MASON; ROBERT C. LEWIS; ALVIN W. KELLER, JR.; BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE; NANCY B. CRITES; OFFICER SEALS; OFFICER THOMPSON; OFFICER JONES; ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT HUNT; PAUL TAYLOR; SANDRA THOMAS; SUPERVISOR TROUBLEFIELD; J. HAYNES, Superintendent; LYNN HENRY; JOHN/JANE DOE, Supervisor in Mailroom; OFFICER MEDLIN; K. DUFAULT; CONNIE BRAY; K. LOCKLEAR; KIMBLE, Medical PDI; NURSE SUPERVISOR COLDSMITH; JANE DOE, Nurse at Lumberton Correctional Institution; JOHN/JANE DOE, Medical Administrator; DOCTOR DAVIS; JOHN/JANE DOE, Doctor; JOHN DOE, Lieutenant; JOHN/JANE DOE, Director of Support Service; BOYD BENNETT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (5:10-ct-03224-B0)

Submitted: September 11, 2012

Decided: September 13, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stuart Wayne Tompkins, Appellant Pro Se. Peter Andrew Regulski, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina; Martin Rossie Jernigan, Elizabeth Pharr McCullough, Kelly Elizabeth Street, YOUNG, MOORE & HENDERSON, PA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stuart Wayne Tompkins appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Tompkins v. Dep't of Corr., No. 5:10-ct-03224-B0 (E.D.N.C. June 13, 2011 & Mar. 21, 2012). We grant Tompkins' motion to file a supplemental brief, deny his motion for appointment of counsel, and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED