

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1802

ERIC NELSON; LISA NELSON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT; ERNEST FINNEY, individually; JEAN HOEFER TOAL, individually; JAMES E. MOORE, individually; JOHN H. WALLER, JR., individually; E.C. BURNETT, III, individually; DISCIPLINARY COUNSEL; HENRY RICHARDSON, individually; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; CHARLES CONDON, individually; JAMES BOGLE, individually; EMORY SMITH, individually; SEVERAL UNKNOWN ATTORNEYS AND/OR INVESTIGATORS, employed by the South Carolina Attorney General, individually; ELDON RISHER,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Florence. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CA-99-2015-4-24)

Submitted: October 4, 2001

Decided: October 11, 2001

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eric Nelson, Lisa Nelson, Appellants Pro Se. Stephen Peterson Groves, Sr., John Hamilton Smith, YOUNG, CLEMENT, RIVERS & TISDALE, Charleston, South Carolina; Richard Mark Gergel, David Eliot Rothstein, GERGEL, NICKLES & SOLOMON, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's order denying relief on their 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2001) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Nelson v. South Carolina Supreme Court, No. CA-99-2015-4-24 (D.S.C. May 14, 2001). 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