

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-2247**

---

YURI J. STOYANOV,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHARLES BEHRLE, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of the Carderock Division, Naval Surface Warfare Center; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; KEVIN M. WILSON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; JOHN C. DAVIES, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Deputy Head of Code 74; BRUCE CROCK, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; DAVID CARON, Individually as in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39, Carderock Division Naval Surface Warfare Center; REUBEN PITTS, III, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 374, Naval Surface Warfare Center at Navy Yard; RAY MABUS, Secretary of the Navy,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

DONALD C. WINTER, Secretary of the Navy,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, Senior District Judge. (1:07-cv-01863-WMN)

---

Submitted: March 29, 2012

Decided: April 2, 2012

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Yuri J. Stoyanov, Appellant Pro Se. John Walter Sippel, Jr.,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yuri J. Stoyanov appeals the district court's order granting Defendants' summary judgment motion on his several federal and state law claims against them, and denying his motions for default and for leave to file a surreply. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. See Stoyanov v. Behrle, No. 1:07-cv-01863-WMN (D. Md. Sept. 20, 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