

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2306

LENIR RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ROSYLN CHILDREN CENTER; BRAZILIAN CONSULATE;
LEAH CAKE SOUTHERLIN, Probation Officer;
BEVERLY RUSSELL, Dr.; FAIRFAX COUNTY ADULT
DETENTION CENTER; URSULA KOENIG; ELLEN ZEHL,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

REX PAGERIE, Officer; KATRENE ENGLAND,
Officer,

Defendants.

No. 04-2568

LENIR RICHARDSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ROSYLN CHILDREN CENTER; REX PAGERIE, Officer;
KATRENE ENGLAND, Officer; BRAZILIAN CONSULATE;
LEAH CAKE SOUTHERLIN, Probation Officer;

BEVERLY RUSSELL, Dr.; FAIRFAX COUNTY ADULT
DETENTION CENTER; URSULA KOENIG; ELLEN ZEHL,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District
Judge. (CA-04-867)

Submitted: March 25, 2005

Decided: April 13, 2005

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

No. 04-2306 dismissed; No. 04-2568 affirmed by unpublished per
curiam opinion.

Lenir Richardson, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Marvel Ross, COUNTY
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Lenir Richardson appeals a district court order dismissing as frivolous some of her claims and some of the defendants under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) (2000) and a district court order dismissing the remainder of her complaint as barred by the statute of limitations. In No. 04-2306, we review the district court's dismissal de novo. We have reviewed the record and find the district court properly dismissed some claims and some defendants as frivolous. Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal as frivolous. In No. 04-2568, we have reviewed the record and the district court's order and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Richardson v. Roslyn Children Center, No. CA-04-867 (E.D. Va. filed Nov. 17, 2004; entered Nov. 19, 2004). We 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.

No. 04-2306 DISMISSED
No. 04-2568 AFFIRMED