

Filed: February 17, 1999

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-6904
(CA-97-82-AM)

Lawrence Turner,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

George M. Hinkle, Warden, et al,

Defendants - Appellees.

O R D E R

The court amends its opinion filed February 5, 1999, as follows:

On the cover sheet, section 3, line 2 -- the judge's name is corrected to read "Theresa Carroll Buchanan, Magistrate Judge."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor
Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-6904

LAWRENCE TURNER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GEORGE M. HINKLE, Warden; CAROLYN M. PARKER,
Operations Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Theresa Carroll Buchanan, Magistrate Judge. (CA-97-82-AM)

Submitted: January 21, 1999

Decided: February 5, 1999

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lawrence Turner, Appellant Pro Se. Martha Murphey Parrish, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Lawrence Turner appeals the magistrate judge's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1998) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Turner's motion to consolidate this appeal with appeal number 98-6993, and affirm on the reasoning of the court. See Turner v. Hinkle, No. CA-97-82-AM (E.D. Va. June 9, 1998).* 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

* Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on June 8, 1998, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on June 9, 1998. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).