

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-6473

MICHAEL ALEXANDER COLLINS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SOUTHERN HEALTH PARTNERS, individual capacity official capacity;
DR. GARNETT, Dentist for ACDC; BRANDY GALLOWAY, individual capacity
official capacity; NURSE ANGEL, individual capacity official capacity; S.
DONALDSON, individual capacity official capacity; B. DEHAYES, individual
capacity official capacity; NURSE CINDY, individual capacity official capacity;
DOCTOR WILLIAMS, individual capacity official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

AIKEN COUNTY DETENTION CENTER,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Anderson. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (8:18-cv-01811-MGL)

Submitted: June 13, 2019

Decided: June 18, 2019

Before WYNN and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Alexander Collins, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Alexander Collins appeals the magistrate judge's order denying his motion for appointment of counsel and the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge, denying Collins' motion for leave to amend the complaint, and granting Defendants' motion for summary judgment on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint.

Because the parties did not consent to proceed before a magistrate judge, and Collins did not challenge the magistrate judge's order by objecting to the district court, the denial of his motion to appoint counsel is not subject to our appellate review. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), (c) (2012); *Colo. Bldg. & Constr. Trades Council v. B.B. Andersen Constr. Co.*, 879 F.2d 809, 811 (10th Cir. 1989); *Gleason v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 777 F.2d 1324, 1324 (8th Cir. 1985).

Concerning the district court's order adopting the recommendation of the magistrate judge, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Collins v. S. Health Partners*, No. 8:18-cv-1811-MGL (D.S.C. Apr. 25, 2019).

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED