

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-7105**

---

MARIO CAICEDO CABEZAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DONALD S. CALDWELL, Roanoke Commonwealth  
Attorney; BETTY JO ANTHONY, Chief Assistant  
Commonwealth Attorney; COMMONWEALTH OF THE  
CITY OF ROANOKE,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James C. Turk, District Judge.  
(CA-99-372)

---

Submitted: November 16, 1999      Decided: December 10, 1999

---

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mario Caicedo Cabezas, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mario Caicedo Cabezas appeals the district court's orders: (1) denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (1994) and 28 U.S.C.A. § 2254 (West 1994 & Supp. 1999); (2) denying his motion to alter or amend judgment; and (3) correcting the style of its previous order. Cabezas originally filed his petition in the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina. That court transferred the case to the Western District of Virginia pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (1994). Cabezas also appeals the transfer order.

We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions denying Cabezas' § 2254 petition and his motion for reconsideration and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal on the reasoning of the district court. See Cabezas v. Caldwell, No. CA-99-372 (W.D. Va. June 8; July 14; & Aug. 2, 1999). To the extent that we have jurisdiction over the transfer order, we find no reversible error in the decision to transfer the case. See 28 U.S.C. § 1404 (1994); see generally Wilson-Cook Medical, Inc. v. Wilson, 942 F.2d 247, 250 (4th Cir. 1991). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal of the transfer order on the reasoning of the district court. See Cabezas v. Caldwell, No. CA-99-0136-23BD (D.S.C. May 12, 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.

DISMISSED