

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-1554**

---

SHANNON KELLY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WEST VIRGINIA BOARD OF LAW EXAMINERS, a West Virginia state agency; LAWRENCE M. SHULTZ, in his official capacity as President of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners; ANCIL G. RAMEY, in his official capacity as Vice-President of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners; SUE ANN HOWARD, in her official capacity as a member of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners; WARD D. STONE, JR., in his official capacity as a member of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners; BRADLEY J. PYLES, in his official capacity as a member of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners; SARAH N. HALL, in her official capacity as a member of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners; JOHN F. CYRUS, in his official capacity as a member of the West Virginia Board of Law Examiners,

Respondents - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Charleston. David A. Faber, Senior District Judge. (2:08-cv-00933-DAF)

---

Submitted: February 11, 2011

Decided: March 18, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Shannon Kelly, Appellant Pro Se. John Michael Hedges, Stephanie Shepherd, BYRNE, HEDGES & LYONS, Morgantown, West Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Shannon Kelly appeals the district court's order entering judgment in favor of the Respondents in his complaint alleging Americans with Disabilities Act, due process, and equal protection violations. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Kelly v. West Virginia Bd. of Law Exam'rs., No. 2:08-cv-00933-DAF (S.D.W. Va. Mar. 31 & Apr. 16, 2010). We deny the Appellees' motion to strike the Appellant's informal reply brief. 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