

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 00-6662**

---

JAMES CALHOUN-EL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

EMSA CORRECTIONAL CARE; GAIL SHORE; DOTTIE  
TIBBLE; MARLENE SHELBY; K. NSUBUGN; DEREFE  
TESFAYE; JULIUS BOATANG; SEBLU ZERA YOHANNES;  
M. AYALEW; RONALD HITCHINSON; JAMES V.  
PEGUESE; MAJOR CLARK; CAPTAIN CHANEY; CAPTAIN  
KOPPEL; LIEUTENANT MARTIN; D. INGRAM, Ser-  
geant; SERGEANT COWANS; OFFICER SAMPSON; M.  
RIDDLE, Officer,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Benson E. Legg, District Judge. (CA-99-  
1266-L)

---

Submitted: September 21, 2000            Decided: September 28, 2000

---

Before WILKINS, NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Calhoun-El, Appellant Pro Se. Donald Joseph Crawford, GODARD,  
WEST & ADELMAN, P.C., Rockville, Maryland; John Joseph Curran, Jr.,  
Attorney General, Glenn William Bell, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

James Calhoun-El 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 and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Calhoun-El v. EMSA Correctional Care, No. CA-99-1266-L (D. Md. May 2, 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 13, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on May 2, 2000. 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).