UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-7534

MICHAEL F. DEHONEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JONATHAN E. OZMINT, Director of South Carolina
Department of Corrections; HENRY MCMASTER,
Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 05-7535

MICHAEL F. DEHONEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

JONATHAN E. OZMINT, Director of South Carolina
Department of Corrections; HENRY MCMASTER,
Attorney General of South Carolina,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 05-7536

HENRY F. DEHONEY,

                                        Petitioner - Appellant,

          versus

JONATHAN E. OZMINT, Director of South Carolina
Department of Corrections; HENRY MCMASTER,
Attorney General of South Carolina,

                                        Respondents - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District
Judge.   (CA-04-21981-HMH-BHH;   CA-04-22025-HMH-BHH;
CA-04-22026-HMH-BMH)

Submitted: April 27, 2006   Decided: May 3, 2006

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael F. Dehoney, Appellant Pro Se. Barton Jon Vincent, DAVIDSON,
MORRISON & LINDEMANN, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael F. Dehoney appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and construing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition under 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 2000) and dismissing the complaint and the order denying his motion to reconsider. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Dehoney v. Ozmint, Nos. CA-04-21981-HMH-BHH; CA-04-22025-HMH-BHH; CA-04-22026-HMH-BMH (D.S.C. Aug. 10 & 29, 2005). 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