

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-2212

BRIAN CHARLES VAETH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY, a municipal corporation; BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FIRE AND POLICE EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF BALTIMORE, a body politic and corporate; GEORGE NILSON, individually and in his official capacity as City Solicitor; JAMES LEVY, MD, individually and in his capacity as Medical Director; FREDERICK MCGRATH, individually and in his capacity as Hearing Examiner for the Fire and Police Employees' Retirement System of the City of Baltimore; THOMAS P. TANEYHILL, in his capacity as Executive Director, Fire and Police Employees' Retirement System of the City of Baltimore; STEPHAN G. FUGATE, in his capacity as former Board Chairman, Fire and Police Employees' Retirement System of the City of Baltimore; JAMES T. CLACK, in his capacity as Chief of the Baltimore City Fire Department,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ROBERT J. SLEDGESKI, in his capacity as President of IAFF Local 734 Baltimore Firefighters,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:11-cv-00182-WDQ)

Submitted: March 29, 2012

Decided: April 6, 2012

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brian Charles Vaeth, Appellant Pro Se. Sabrina Willis, BALTIMORE CITY DEPARTMENT OF LAW, Baltimore, Maryland; Christopher Roderick Ryon, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Brian Charles Vaeth appeals the district court's order dismissing his action raising various state and federal claims in connection with his termination from employment. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Vaeth v. Mayor and City Council, No. 1:11-cv-00182-WDQ (D. Md. Jan. 3, 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