

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-1682**

---

JAMES B. SPENCER; DORIS E HOLT, Estate of Doris E. Holt,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

RODNEY LAIL, a/k/a Keith Lail, a/k/a Rodney Keith Lail; IRENE  
SANTACROCE; RICKY STEPHENS; MARGUERITE STEPHENS;  
NICHOLAS C. WILLIAMSON; DAN GREEN,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HORRY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA; STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA;  
SOUTH CAROLINA LAW ENFORCEMENT DIVISION; DAVID  
CALDWELL; LARRY GAINEY; MICHAEL PRODAN; MARK KEEL;  
JOHNNY MORGAN, Horry County Police Chief ,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; N JOHN BENSON; PHIL CELESTINI;  
PAUL GARDNER; DAVID M HARDY; KERRY HAYNES; THOMAS  
ISABELLA, JR.; MICHAEL KIRKPATRICK; THOMAS MARSH; MONTE  
DELL MCKEE; MATTHEW PERRY; GEORGE SKALUBA; CHRIS  
SWECKER; NOEL HEROLD; FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONS;  
UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT; UNKNOWN JOHN DOES,

Defendants,

and

JAY SALEEBY, Aiken, Bridges, Nunn, Elliott & Tyler, P.A.; SOUTH CAROLINA STATE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD,

Movants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (3:11-cv-00977-MGL)

---

Submitted: February 21, 2019

Decided: March 20, 2019

---

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John P. Batson, JOHN P. BATSON, LAW OFFICE, Augusta, Georgia, for Appellants. Eugene H. Matthews, RICHARDSON PLOWDEN & ROBINSON, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina; James M. Saleeby, Jr., AIKEN BRIDGES ELLIOTT TYLER & SALEEBY, P.A., Florence, South Carolina; Andrew F. Lindemann, LINDEMANN DAVIS & HUGHES, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James B. Spencer and the Estate of Doris E. Holt appeal the district court's orders adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing the claims against some of the Appellees for failure to effect service of process, adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing the remaining claims with prejudice, and denying reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Spencer v. South Carolina*, No. 3:11-cv-00977-MGL (D.S.C. Aug. 30, 2012; Sept. 19, 2013; Jan. 31, 2014; Mar. 1, 2018; & May 16, 2018). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*AFFIRMED*