

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-7297

MARTIN AVILA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

EDGEFIELD FEDERAL PRISON; MRS. MARY MITCHELL, Warden; MR. ACOSTA, Assist Warden; MR. COLLIE, Capt; MR. CLARK, Lt; MR. HOLLET, Lt; MR. NEAL, C Unit Manager; MR. H. KROGER, III, B Unit Manager; MRS. S. CHEEK, B Case Manager; MR. J. BRYANT, B Counselor; MR. JOHNSON, C Counselor; MR. SANTIAGO, SIS; MR. ROPER, Unit Officer; MR. UPSON, Unit Officer; MR. FLORES, Unit Officer; MR. KATE, Unit Officer; MRS. MARTIN, Unit Officer; MR. GREEN, Unit Officer; MR. EVANS, Unit Officer; MRS. JACKSON, Unit Manager; MR. FALLEN, Assist Warden; MR. S. SMITH, Recreation; MR. T. NIXON; MR. J. SULLIVAN; MR. SPARK; MRS. LATHROP; MR. L. MORGAN, Unit Officer; MR. WILSON, Unit Officer; MR. BURKETT, B; MR. BURKETT; MRS. V. KEPNER, Education,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (0:10-cv-02370-HMH)

Submitted: January 20, 2012

Decided: February 3, 2012

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Martin Avila, Appellant Pro Se. Marshall Prince, II, Assistant
United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Martin Avila appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying Avila's Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 motions seeking leave to amend his complaint. Although we find that Avila's objections to the magistrate judge's report were sufficient to preserve appellate review of his claims, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985). Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Avila v. Edgefield Fed. Prison, No. 0:10-cv-02370-HMH (D.S.C. July 21, 2011). 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