

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6671**

---

JOHNNIE CORDERO,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF COLUMBIA, The, South Carolina; JOSEPH H. TIMMONS, III, individually and in his official capacity as Risk Manager of the City of Columbia South Carolina also known as Chip; HATTIE M. BING, individually and in her official capacity as Deputy Director of the City of Columbia Department of Parks and Recreation; S. ALISON BAKER, individually and in his official capacity as Senior Assistant City Manager and Director of the Department of Parks and Recreation of the City of Columbia South Carolina; JACQUE GILLIAM, individually; PAMELA BENJAMIN, in her official capacity as Director of Human Resources for the City of Columbia South Carolina,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

JACQUE GILLIAM, in his official capacity as Director of Human Resources for the City of Columbia South Carolina,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (3:11-cv-02502-JFA)

---

Submitted: October 17, 2013

Decided: October 21, 2013

---

Before AGEE, DAVIS, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Johnnie Cordero, Appellant Pro Se. William Allen Nickles, III,  
NICKLES LAW FIRM, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Johnnie Cordero appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Cordero's complaint alleging violations under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) and the Americans with Disabilities Act. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Cordero v. City of Columbia, No. 3:11-cv-02502-JFA (D.S.C. Mar. 27, 2013). 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