

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-1248**

---

JERRY J. MATHIS, Individually and as a representative of the  
Organization, "Citizens for Change",

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

C. ANTHONY MUSE, Individually and in his official capacity as  
State Senator,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

LARNZELL MARTIN, JR., Judge, Individually and in his official  
capacity as Justice of the Circuit Court of Prince George's  
County; JOHN P. MCDONOUGH, Individually and in his official  
capacity as Secretary of State of the State of Maryland;  
KATHLEEN E. WHERTHEY, Individually and in her official  
capacity as Assistant Attorney General of the State of  
Maryland; DOUGLAS F. GANSLER, Individually and in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the State of Maryland; L.  
BERRYMAN, Deputy, Prince George's County Sheriff's Dept.,  
Individually and in her official capacity as Sheriff Deputies  
for Prince George's County, Md.; JARED DEMARINIS, Individually  
and in his official capacity as Director for the Maryland  
Board of Elections,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District Judge.  
(8:13-cv-02597-JFM)

---

Submitted: November 29, 2016

Decided: December 15, 2016

---

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jerry J. Mathis, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer L. Katz, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jerry J. Mathis appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Defendant, Senator C. Anthony Muse, on Mathis' 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. Mathis v. Muse, No. 8:13-cv-02597-JFM (D. Md. filed Feb. 25, 2016 & entered Feb. 26, 2016). We also grant Senator Muse's motion to strike the exhibits attached to Mathis' reply brief and deny Mathis' motion to supplement the record with those exhibits. 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