

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-6553

ALAN DALE CHRONISTER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES R. METTS, Sheriff; PRISON HEALTH
SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Charleston. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., District
Judge; Robert S. Carr, Magistrate Judge. (2:04-cv-22848-HMH)

Submitted: September 27, 2006

Decided: October 31, 2006

Before WILKINSON, WILLIAMS, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Alan Dale Chronister, Appellant Pro Se. William Henry Davidson,
II, DAVIDSON, MORRISON & LINDEMANN, P.A., Columbia, South Carolina;
Ashley S. Heslop, TURNER, PADGET, GRAHAM & LANEY, P.A., Charleston,
South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Alan Dale Chronister appeals the magistrate judge's order denying Chronister's motion to appoint counsel, the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000) complaint, and the district court's order denying Chronister's motion filed under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). We have reviewed the record and find that there was no abuse of discretion in the denial of the motions to appoint counsel and for reconsideration. Accordingly, we affirm those orders for the reasons stated by the district court. Chronister v. Metts, No. 2:04-cv-22848-HMH (D.S.C. Feb. 15, 2005; Mar. 28, 2006).

Turning to the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying § 1983 relief, we note that Chronister failed to challenge the bases for the district court's rejection of his claims in his informal appellate brief. Thus, he has waived appellate review of that order. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief."). We deny Chronister's motion to appoint 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