Certiorari dismissed, April 5, 2010

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 09-6521

_____

ISIAH JAMES, JR.,

                    Plaintiff - Appellant,

          v.

C. KELLY JACKSON; SAMUEL WATSON; ROBERT WARD; WANDA BONY;
CHRISTOPHER FELDER; SHIRLEY SINGLETON; LAVERN COHEN; CHERYL
RIDGE; JOHN DOE, of - and scientific testing laboratories;
CARL FREDERICK; DANIEL J. MURPHY; BLAKE TAYLOR; REGINA
SPANN; JON OZMINT; SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS;
C. ANTHONEY BURTON,

                    Defendants - Appellees.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Beaufort. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.
(9:08-cv-00144-TLW)

_____

Submitted: October 15, 2009   Decided: November 6, 2009

_____

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

_____

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Isiah James, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Erin Mary Farrell, Daniel
Roy Settana, Jr., MCKAY, CAUTHEN, SETTANA & STUBLEY, PA,
Columbia, South Carolina; Joseph Calhoun Watson, SOWELL, GRAY,
STEPP & LAFFITTE, LLC, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Isiah James, Jr., appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint, and the court's order denying his post-judgment motions to alter or amend the judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), and to amend the complaint. James also appeals the magistrate judge's orders denying his motions to recuse and for sanctions. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court and the magistrate judge. James v. Jackson, No. 9:08-cv-00144-TLW (D.S.C. filed Mar. 26, 2008 & entered Mar. 27, 2008; Sept. 2, 2008; Nov. 5, 2008; Feb. 4, 2009; Feb. 27, 2009). 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