

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-6565**

---

TIMOTHY LLOYD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MICHAEL W. MOORE, Director of South Carolina Department of Corrections; RICHARD WITKOWSKI, Warden for Dutchman Correctional Institution; PAUL W. BREWTON, Major of Security for Dutchman Correctional Institution; BURKE BROWN, Principal for Dutchman Correctional Institution; DUTCHMAN CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION, members of classification committee,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Solomon Blatt, Jr., Senior District Judge. (CA-98-1415-9-8RB)

---

Submitted: September 8, 2000                      Decided: September 15, 2000

---

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

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Timothy Lloyd, Appellant Pro Se. William Ussery Gunn, Shelton Sterling Laney, III, HOLCOMBE, BOMAR, GUNN & BRADFORD, P.A., Spartanburg, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Timothy Lloyd appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Lloyd v. Moore, No. CA-98-1415-9-8RB (D.S.C. Apr. 5, 2000).<sup>\*</sup> 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

---

<sup>\*</sup> Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on April 4, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on April 5, 2000. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was physically 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).