

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-6172**

---

MICHAEL C. BAXLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;  
MICHAEL W. MOORE, Commissioner; WILLIAM R.  
DAVIS, Warden; GEORGE N. MARTIN, III, Regional  
Director; WILLIAM D. CATOE, Deputy Director;  
DISCIPLINARY HEARING OFFICER; TIM BETHEA, In-  
mate Representative; CAPTAIN HUGHES, Lee C.I.,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 99-7460**

---

MICHAEL C. BAXLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;  
MICHAEL W. MOORE, Commissioner; WILLIAM R.  
DAVIS, Warden; GEORGE N. MARTIN, III, Regional  
Director; WILLIAM D. CATOE, Deputy Director;  
CAPTAIN HUGHES, Lee C.I., DISCIPLINARY HEARING  
OFFICER; TIM BETHEA, Inmate Representative,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge; William M. Catoe, Jr., Magistrate Judge. (CA-98-2344-6-17AK)

---

Submitted: December 16, 1999                      Decided: December 21, 1999

---

Before MURNAGHAN and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael C. Baxley, Appellant Pro Se. Charles Franklin Turner, Jr., CLARKSON, FORTSON, WALSH & RHENEY, P.A., Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael C. Baxley appeals from the district court's orders: (1) denying his motion to amend his complaint; (2) denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaint; and (3) denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Baxley v. South Carolina Dep't of Corrections, No. CA-98-2344-6-17AK (D.S.C. Jan. 8; June 4; and Oct. 7, 1999). 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