## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1077

THEODORE JUSTICE, for Son,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DR. TIMOTHY FARLEY, Granville County School Superintendent;
MARY WATSON, Director Exceptional Children; AUGUSTUS B.
ELKINS, Administrative Law Judge; HONORABLE JULIAN MANN,
III, Administrative Law Judge; AMY MILLER, Program Director
Exceptional Children; MICHAEL ALLEN, Director Exceptional
Children; KATHY TWISDALE, Principal Stovall Shaw
Elementary; ROBYNN WILLIAMS, Special Education Teacher;
JAMES E. CROSS, JR., Attorney Granville County Schools;
DALE W. HENSLEY, Attorney Granville County Schools; KATE
NEALE, Consultant for Dispute Resolution Department of
Public Instruction Exceptional Children Division; JULIE
RICHARDS, Clerk of Court,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (5:13-cv-00343-D)

Submitted: April 24, 2014 Decided: April 29, 2014

Before NIEMEYER, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Theodore Justice, Appellant Pro Se. John Graham Corriher, Kenneth Alexander Soo, THARRINGTON SMITH LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina; Laura Ellen Crumpler, Susannah Porter Holloway, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Tiffany Y. Lucas, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Theodore Justice appeals the district court's order dismissing his complaint raising claims under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2) (2012) and the United States Constitution. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Justice v. Farley, No. 5:13-cv-00343-D (E.D.N.C. Jan. 21, 2014). We grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis. 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