

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1482

ANAND L. DANIELL,

Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL VUKOSA, Individually on behalf Himself and All Others Similarly Situated; MICHAEL JOSENHANS, Individually on Behalf of Himself and All Others Similarly Situated; ROBERT COLLIER, Individually on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated; SALLY LEBOW,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

SOURCEFIRE, INC.; JOHN C. BECKER; MARTIN F. ROESCH; STEVEN R. POLK; TIM A. GULERI; MICHAEL CRISTINZIANO; ARNOLD L. PUNARO; CHARLES E. PETERS, JR.; KEVIN M. KLAUSMEYER; CISCO SYSTEMS, INCORPORATED; SHASTA ACQUISITION CORP.; ACQUISITION CORP.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, Senior District Judge. (1:13-cv-02271-JFM; 1:13-cv-02332-JFM; 1:13-cv-02377-JFM; 1:13-cv-02483-JKB)

Submitted: October 31, 2014

Decided: November 19, 2014

Before DUNCAN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Anand L. Daniell, Appellant Pro Se. Edward B. Gerard, Stephen J. Oddo, Justin D. Rieger, ROBBINS ARROYO LLP, San Diego, California; Patrick Charles Smith, DEHAY & ELLISTON, LLP, Baltimore, Maryland; Yelena Trepetin, Charles J. Piven, Charles Noah Insler, BROWER PIVEN, Stevenson, Maryland; Evan J. Smith, BRODSKY & SMITH, LLC, Bala Cynwyd, Pennsylvania; Mark D. Gately, HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP, Baltimore, Maryland; Joseph K. Kanada, Erik Jeffrey Olson, MORRISON & FOERSTER, LLP, Palo Alto, California; Thomas Matthew Buchanan, WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP, Washington, D.C.; J. Erik Connolly, Robert L. Michels, Dan K. Webb, Andrew J. Yahkind, WINSTON & STRAWN, LLP, Chicago, Illinois, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anand L. Daniell appeals the district court's order certifying a class for a class action complaint and approving a settlement agreement, thereby overruling Daniell's objection to the settlement. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Daniell v. Vukosa, Nos. 1:13-cv-02271-JFM; 1:13-cv-02332-JFM; 1:13-cv-02377-JFM; 1:13-cv-02483-JKB (D. Md. Apr. 18, 2014). 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