

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 06-1774**

---

CHRIS HOLLOMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF MYRTLE BEACH SC; ROBERT STARR,  
individually as an officer with the Myrtle  
Beach Police Department,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.  
(4:04-cv-01868-TLW)

---

Submitted: July 31, 2007

Decided: August 15, 2007

---

Before WILKINSON and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

J. Christopher Mills, J. CHRISTOPHER MILLS, LLC, Columbia, South  
Carolina, for Appellant. Cynthia Graham Howe, BATTLE & VAUGHT,  
P.A., Conway, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Chris Holloman appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of the City of Myrtle Beach and Officer Robert Starr on Holloman's claims brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000). Summary judgment is appropriate only if, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986); Evans v. Technologies Applications & Serv. Co., 80 F.3d 954, 958 (4th Cir. 1996). We have thoroughly reviewed the briefs and joint appendix and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Holloman v. City of Myrtle Beach, No. 4:04-cv-01868-TLW (D.S.C. June 8, 2006).<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>Subsequent to the filing of Holloman's notice of appeal, the district court granted Holloman's motion to correct the judgment. The district court entered an amended judgment declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over Holloman's state law claims and remanding those claims to state court. That order is not at issue in this appeal.