

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1014

MAYNER J. POPE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BALTIMORE COUNTY; BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF BALTIMORE COUNTY; DR. IRVING PRESSLEY MCPHAIL, Chancellor; DR. LEILA GONZALEZ-SULLIVAN, President; DR. JUDY SNYDER; DR. PATRICIA BLOOM, Dean of Students; BARBARA TOWERS, Dean of Instruction; DEBBIE WAINWRIGHT, Director of Minority Affairs; DR. RICHARD H. LILLEY, Administrator for Academic Service; DR. C. RALPH STEPHENS, Chairperson; R. THOMAS GREGORY, Art Department Head; SAM TRESS, Chief; JOANN LARRIMORE, Adjunct Instructor,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Alexander Harvey II, Senior District Judge. (CA-99-1953-H)

Submitted: May 25, 2000

Decided: June 2, 2000

Before WILLIAMS, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mayner J. Pope, Appellant Pro Se. Kathy Marie Britton-Bracey, Assistant County Attorney, Virginia Wood Barnhart, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Towson, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mayner J. Pope appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment for defendants in this civil rights action. 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 Pope v. Baltimore County, No. CA-99-1953-H (D. Md. Oct. 25, 1999).^{*} Pope also challenges the district court's denial of her motion to alter and amend the judgment. We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion. See Pacific Ins. Co. v. American Nat'l Fire Ins. Co., 148 F.3d 396, 402 (4th Cir. 1998).

We deny Pope's motion for appointment of counsel. 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

^{*} Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on October 22, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on October 25, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, we take the date the order was entered on the docket sheet as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).