

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-6467

WILLARD LEAMON MARTIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

BEAUFORT COUNTY JUDGE AND COURT; BEAUFORT
COUNTY JAIL SUPERVISOR; DON LUNDGREN,* of
Sacramento California,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 99-6468

WILLARD LEAMON MARTIN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

* In his original complaint in action number 99-6467, Martin named Don Lundgren as Attorney General of California and, consequently, Lundgren was included on the district court's docket sheet as a defendant in the action. After the district court consolidated Martin's habeas and civil rights actions, Lundgren's name appeared on some, but not all, pleadings filed by Martin and orders entered by the court. Lundgren was never served, however, and he made no appearance in the district court or this court.

BEAUFORT COUNTY COURT JUDGE; BEAUFORT COUNTY
JAIL SUPERVISOR,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. Dennis W. Shedd, District Judge.
(CA-97-3411-4-19-BD, CA-97-3351-4-19-BD)

Submitted: August 19, 1999 Decided: August 26, 1999

Before WIDENER and KING, Circuit Judges, and PHILLIPS, Senior Cir-
cuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Willard Leamon Martin, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen P. Hughes, HOWELL,
GIBSON & HUGHES, P.A., Beaufort, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Willard Leamon Martin appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999) complaints. 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 Martin v. Beaufort County Judge, Nos. CA-97-3411-4-19-BD; CA-97-3351-4-19-BD (D.S.C. Mar. 10, 1999). We deny Martin's motions for a hearing and for appointment of counsel and 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