

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-7077**

---

BERNARD MCFADDEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CLARENDON COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; MANNING CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; STEVE MCKENZIE, PCR Witness; HAROLD WALKER DETWILER, III, First Public Defender; WALTER RIGGS, Second Public Defender; JOE T. BRADHAM, Assistant Chief of the Manning Police; MARK CREECH, Investigator of the Manning Police Department; R. FERRELL COTHRAN, JR., Assistant Solicitor for Clarendon County - Third Judicial Circuit; DAVID F. MCINNIS, Trial Judge; WILLIAM JOHNSON, First Appointed PCR Attorney; JOHN C. LAND, IV, Second Appointed PCR Attorney; BEULAH G. ROBERTS, Clarendon County Clerk of Court; THOMAS W. COOPER, Chief Judge of Clarendon County - Third Circuit Court; LEA C. ANN THIGPEN, Court Reporter of Clarendon County; BENJAMIN APLIN, Assistant Attorney General for South Carolina; HARRY L. DEVOE, JR., Third Appointed PCR Attorney; AMOS HATCHER, Captain of the Clarendon County Jail,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CA-00-2536-3-24)

---

Submitted: October 4, 2001

Decided: October 12, 2001

---

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bernard McFadden, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Bernard McFadden appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2001) complaint under 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915A (West Supp. 2001). 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 McFadden v. Clarendon County Sheriff's Dep't, No. CA-00-2536-3-24 (D.S.C. May 22, 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