

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6034

DAVID L. CARTER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE; JANET RENO; U.S. BUREAU
OF PRISONS; KATHLEEN HAWK SAWYER, Custodian;
FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION - EDGEFIELD;
M. E. RAY, Warden of Federal Correctional In-
stitution, Edgefield,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 00-6575

DAVID L. CARTER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

KATHLEEN HAWK SAWYER, Custodian U.S. Bureau of
Prisons; STEPHEN COAL, Warden and Executive
Officer, FCI Estill,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CA-99-1087-2-18, CA-00-196-2-18AJ)

Submitted: July 13, 2000

Decided: July 20, 2000

Before WIDENER, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David L. Carter, Appellant Pro Se. Barbara Murcier Bowens, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

David L. Carter appeals the district court's orders denying relief on his petitions filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (1994). We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Carter v. United States, No. CA-99-1087-2-18 (D.S.C. Dec. 21, 1999); Carter v. Sawyer, No. CA-00-196-2-18AJ (D.S.C. Mar. 13, 2000). Carter has filed a motion seeking a writ of habeas corpus ad testificandum, appointment of counsel, stay of any prison transfer, medical care by an independent doctor, daily access to legal material and a law library, and a copy of the informal briefing order. We deny the motion in all respects except for a copy of the informal briefing order, which has been provided to him. 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.

AFFIRMED