

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-2139

MICHAEL A. MCNEIL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND; HOWARD COUNTY, Maryland; HOWARD COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT; DIANE O. LEASURE, Chief Administrative Judge, in her Official and Individual Capacity; LOUIS A. BECKER, III, Associate Judge, in his Official Capacity; MARY M. KRAMER, Master in Chancery, in her Official Capacity; LISA S. MOHINK, Family Law Coordinator, in her Official and Individual Capacity; PATRICIA BRIGHT, Court Social Worker, in her Official and Individual Capacity; CHRISTINIA BIEGANSKI, Supervised Visitation Center Manager, in her Official and Individual Capacity; SUSAN R. GNATT, Supervisory Court Reporter, in her Official and Individual Capacity; STEPHEN A. DRAZIN; PETER V. MARKUSKI, JR.; SARAH P. MCNEIL; VINCENT LOVE; M. SLUTSKY & ASSOCIATES, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Chief District Judge. (8:11-cv-02495-DKC)

Submitted: January 17, 2013

Decided: January 22, 2013

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael A. McNeil, Appellant Pro Se. Hugh Scott Curtis, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Louis Paul Ruzzi, HOWARD COUNTY OFFICE OF LAW, Ellicott City, Maryland; Stephen A. Drazin, Columbia, Maryland; Jeffrey Wayne Bernstein, GOOZMAN, BERNSTEIN & MARKUSKI, Laurel, Maryland; Sarah P. McNeil, Ellicott City, Maryland; Timothy J. Mummert, Ferndale, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael A. McNeil appeals the district court's order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint and related claims. 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. McNeil v. Maryland, No. 8:11-cv-02495-DKC (D. Md. Aug. 22, 2012). We deny McNeil's motion to strike the Appellees' briefs and 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