

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-8558**

---

MICHAEL WAYNE MONTGOMERY, a/k/a Shaka Zulu X,  
a/k/a Thomas Edward Howard,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LAURA BESSINGER, Warden/Head Administrator,  
Kirkland Correctional Institute; CAPTAIN  
JACKSON, Captain over other Security Staff at  
Kirkland Correctional Institute; NURSE STAN-  
LEY, Nurse, Maximum Security Unit, Kirkland  
Correctional Institute; LIEUTENANT DAVIS,  
Second Shift Supervisor at Maximum Security  
Unit of Kirkland Correctional Institute;  
DOCTOR NEAL, Physician, Kirkland Correctional  
Institute; PARKER EVATT, Commissioner, South  
Carolina Department of Corrections; B. LYMORE,  
Sergeant, Kirkland Correctional Institute; B.  
RUTHERFORD, Correctional Officer, Kirkland  
Correctional Institute, Maximum Security Unit;  
DWAYNE WALKER, Correctional Officer, Kirkland  
Correctional Institute, Maximum Security Unit;  
VAUGHN JACKSON, Captain; LIEUTENANT MARTIN,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Greenville. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District  
Judge. (CA-93-896-6-3AK, CA-93-909-6-3AK, CA-93-2158-6-3AK, CA-93-  
2159-6-3AK, CA-94-247-6-3AK)

---

Submitted: May 16, 1996

Decided: May 31, 1996

---

---

Before RUSSELL, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Wayne Montgomery, Appellant Pro Se. William Henry Davidson, II, Andrew Frederick Lindemann, Elizabeth Krawcheck Rodgers, ELLIS, LAWHORNE, DAVIDSON & SIMS, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1988) 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. Montgomery v. Bessinger, Nos. CA-93-896-6-3AK; CA-93-909-6-3AK; CA-93-2158-6-3AK; CA-2159-6-3AK; CA-94-247-6-3AK (D.S.C. Dec. 6, 1995). 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