

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-7193

JAMES FURTICK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL MOORE; CHARLES M. CONDON, Attorney
General of the State of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 99-7194

JAMES FURTICK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL MOORE; CHARLES MOLONY CONDON, Attorney
General of the State of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Matthew J. Perry, Jr., Senior Dis-
trict Judge. (CA-98-2096-3-10BC, CA-98-1918-3-10BC)

Submitted: December 16, 1999

Decided: December 22, 1999

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Furtick, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina; William Ansel Collins, Jr., SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James Furtick appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (1994) petitions. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Furtick v. Moore, Nos. CA-98-2096-3-10BC; CA-98-1918-3-10BC (D.S.C. Aug. 2, 1999).* We grant Furtick's motion to consolidate his appeals 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 30, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on August 2, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date 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).