Bartola Pacetti v. Mark Millard Appeal: 12-1828 Doc: 16 Filed: 11/19/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

## Doc. 404177901

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1828

BARTOLA J. PACETTI,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MARK S. MILLARD, Judge; ALAN CARLSON; STATE OF CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner of Social Security Administration; MARY HOLT; KATHY RICCI,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:11-cv-01293-LO-TCB)

Submitted: November 9, 2012 Decided: November 19, 2012

Before DAVIS, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bartola J. Pacetti, Appellant Pro Se. Nicholas Foris Simopoulos, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia; Julia Bougie Judkins, BANCROFT, MCGAVIN,

Appeal: 12-1828 Doc: 16 Filed: 11/19/2012 Pg: 2 of 3

HORVATH & JUDKINS, PC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Bartola J. Pacetti appeals the district court's orders granting the Appellees' motions to dismiss the claims against them in his civil action.\* We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Pacetti v. Millard, No. 1:11-cv-01293-LO-TCB (E.D. Va. May 3, 2012 & filed Apr. 17, 2012, entered Apr. 18, 2012). 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

<sup>\*</sup> Although this appeal was interlocutory when the notice of appeal was filed, we have jurisdiction over the appeal because the district court has since entered final judgment. See In re Bryson, 406 F.3d 284, 289 (4th Cir. 2005); Equip. Fin. Grp., Inc. v. Traverse Computer Brokers, 973 F.2d 345, 347-48 (4th Cir. 1992).