

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-6933

ISAAC EUGENE SLAPPY,

and

Plaintiff - Appellant,

JEFFERY RAY ADDY; MUSA BANSHEE,

versus

Plaintiffs,

J. BRYANT DIEHL; TOP REPUBLIC TOBACCO,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 00-6936

JEFFERY RAY ADDY,

and

Plaintiff - Appellant,

ISAAC EUGENE SLAPPY; MUSA BANSHEE,

versus

Plaintiffs,

J. BRYANT DIEHL; TOP REPUBLIC TOBACCO,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CA-99-3125-3-18BC)

Submitted: October 12, 2000

Decided: October 20, 2000

Before WILLIAMS and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Isaac Eugene Slappy, Jeffery Ray Addy, Appellants Pro Se. Terry B. Millar, Rock Hill, South Carolina; Thomas Frank Dougall, Jeffrey L. Shaw, BOWERS, ORR & DOUGALL, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Isaac Eugene Slappy (No. 00-6933) and Jeffery Ray Addy (No. 00-6936) separately appeal the district court's order denying relief on their 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaint and the district court's orders denying their separately filed motions to alter or amend. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and find no reversible error in the denial of relief on the § 1983 complaint. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Slappy v. Diehl, No. CA-99-3125-3-18BC; Addy v. Diehl, No. CA-99-3125-3-18BC (D.S.C. May 18, 2000). Because we find no abuse of discretion, we further affirm the district court's denial of Appellants' motions filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). See Temkin v. Frederick County Comm'r, 945 F.2d 716, 724 (4th Cir. 1991). 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. We deny Appellants' motions for appointment of counsel.

AFFIRMED