

FILED: December 20, 2018

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1903
(3:16-cv-03212-TLW)

DR. D.M. INDIKA BANDARA

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

DAN MANN, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members, AAE Director; JAMES A. COMPTON, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members (Chairman); CAROL FOWLER, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; F. XAVIER STARKES, Esq, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; WILLIAM DUKES, a/k/a Bill, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; JERROD F. HOWARD, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; RICHARD MCINTYRE, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; DAN P. BELL, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; HAZEL L. BENNETT, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; D. J. CARSON, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; DAVID N. JORDAN, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; JAMES L. WHITMIRE, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; DUANE COOPER, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; LYNNE DOUGLAS, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members

Defendants – Appellees

JUDGMENT

In accordance with the decision of this court, the judgment of the district court is affirmed.

This judgment shall take effect upon issuance of this court's mandate in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 41.

/s/ PATRICIA S. CONNOR, CLERK

UNPUBLISHED

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

No. 18-1903

DR. D.M. INDIKA BANDARA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DAN MANN, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members, AAE Director; JAMES A. COMPTON, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members (Chairman); CAROL FOWLER, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; F. XAVIER STARKES, Esq, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; WILLIAM DUKES, a/k/a Bill, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; JERROD F. HOWARD, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; RICHARD MCINTYRE, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; DAN P. BELL, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; HAZEL L. BENNETT, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; D. J. CARSON, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; DAVID N. JORDAN, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; JAMES L. WHITMIRE, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; DUANE COOPER, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members; LYNNE DOUGLAS, Richland-Lexington Airport District Commission Members,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District Judge. (3:16-cv-03212-TLW)

Submitted: December 18, 2018

Decided: December 20, 2018

Before AGEE, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

D.M. Indika Bandara, Appellant Pro Se. Carey Michael Ayer, DAVIS FRAWLEY, LLC, Lexington, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

D.M. Indika Bandara appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on her complaint raising claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d to 2000d-7 (2012). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Bandara v. Mann*, No. 3:16-cv-03212-TLW (D.S.C. filed June 6 & entered June 7, 2018). 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

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1903, D.M. Bandara v. Dan Mann
3:16-cv-03212-TLW

NOTICE OF JUDGMENT

Judgment was entered on this date in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please be advised of the following time periods:

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI: To be timely, a petition for certiorari must be filed in the United States Supreme Court within 90 days of this court's entry of judgment. The time does not run from issuance of the mandate. If a petition for panel or en banc rehearing is timely filed, the time runs from denial of that petition. Review on writ of certiorari is not a matter of right, but of judicial discretion, and will be granted only for compelling reasons. (www.supremecourt.gov)

VOUCHERS FOR PAYMENT OF APPOINTED OR ASSIGNED COUNSEL:

Vouchers must be submitted within 60 days of entry of judgment or denial of rehearing, whichever is later. If counsel files a petition for certiorari, the 60-day period runs from filing the certiorari petition. (Loc. R. 46(d)). If payment is being made from CJA funds, counsel should submit the CJA 20 or CJA 30 Voucher through the CJA eVoucher system. In cases not covered by the Criminal Justice Act, counsel should submit the Assigned Counsel Voucher to the clerk's office for payment from the Attorney Admission Fund. An Assigned Counsel Voucher will be sent to counsel shortly after entry of judgment. Forms and instructions are also available on the court's web site, www.ca4.uscourts.gov, or from the clerk's office.

BILL OF COSTS: A party to whom costs are allowable, who desires taxation of costs, shall file a Bill of Costs within 14 calendar days of entry of judgment. (FRAP 39, Loc. R. 39(b)).

PETITION FOR REHEARING AND PETITION FOR REHEARING EN BANC:

A petition for rehearing must be filed within 14 calendar days after entry of judgment, except that in civil cases in which the United States or its officer or agency is a party, the petition must be filed within 45 days after entry of judgment. A petition for rehearing en banc must be filed within the same time limits and in the same document as the petition for rehearing and must be clearly identified in the title. The only grounds for an extension of time to file a petition for rehearing are the death or serious illness of counsel or a family member (or of a party or family member in pro se cases) or an extraordinary circumstance wholly beyond the control of counsel or a party proceeding without counsel.

Each case number to which the petition applies must be listed on the petition and included in the docket entry to identify the cases to which the petition applies. A timely filed petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc stays the mandate and tolls the running of time for filing a petition for writ of certiorari. In consolidated criminal appeals, the filing of a petition for rehearing does not stay the mandate as to co-defendants not joining in the petition for rehearing. In consolidated civil appeals arising from the same civil action, the court's mandate will issue at the same time in all appeals.

A petition for rehearing must contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the following situations exist: (1) a material factual or legal matter was overlooked; (2) a change in the law occurred after submission of the case and was overlooked; (3) the opinion conflicts with a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court, this court, or another court of appeals, and the conflict was not addressed; or (4) the case involves one or more questions of exceptional importance. A petition for rehearing, with or without a petition for rehearing en banc, may not exceed 3900 words if prepared by computer and may not exceed 15 pages if handwritten or prepared on a typewriter. Copies are not required unless requested by the court. (FRAP 35 & 40, Loc. R. 40(c)).

MANDATE: In original proceedings before this court, there is no mandate. Unless the court shortens or extends the time, in all other cases, the mandate issues 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing. A timely petition for rehearing, petition for rehearing en banc, or motion to stay the mandate will stay issuance of the mandate. If the petition or motion is denied, the mandate will issue 7 days later. A motion to stay the mandate will ordinarily be denied, unless the motion presents a substantial question or otherwise sets forth good or probable cause for a stay. (FRAP 41, Loc. R. 41).