

Filed: February 17, 2000

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 99-7606  
(CA-99-549-3-20BC)

---

Charles Wayne Wade, Jr.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

Escod Industries, etc., et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

O R D E R

---

The court amends its opinion filed February 14, 2000, as follows:

On the cover sheet, section 3, line 3 -- the district court number is corrected to read "CA-99-549-3-20BC."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor  
Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-7606**

---

CHARLES WAYNE WADE, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ESCOD INDUSTRIES AT EVANS CORRECTIONAL INSTI-  
TUTION; GENE BAKER; GEORGE BOSS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Columbia. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District Judge.  
(CA-99-549-3-20BC)

---

Submitted: February 10, 2000

Decided: February 14, 2000

---

Before WIDENER and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Charles Wayne Wade, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Ronald James Tryon,  
PARKER, POE, ADAMS & BERNSTEIN, L.L.P., Columbia, South Carolina;  
Andrew Foster McLeod, HARRIS & MCLEOD, Cheraw, South Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Charles Wade, Jr. appeals the district court's order denying Wade's motions to compel and denying relief on Wade's complaint alleging defamation; breach of contract; violations of 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999); and Title VII. 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 Wade v. Escod Industries, No. CA-99-547-3-20BC (D.S.C. Oct. 28, 1999).<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 October 26, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on October 28, 1999. It is the date the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and 79(a); Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).