

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-7136**

---

ELWOOD COX-EL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MIKE HENNLEIN, Commanding Officer,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Frederic N. Smalkin, District Judge. (CA-99-2113-S)

---

Submitted: November 18, 1999

Decided: November 24, 1999

---

Before WILKINS, HAMILTON, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Elwood Cox-El, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Elwood Cox-El appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaint. 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 Cox-El v. Hennlein, No. CA-99-2113-S (D. Md. July 23, 1999).\* We deny Cox-El's motion for the appointment of counsel and 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 July 21, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on July 23, 1999. 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. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).