Eddie Wise v. USDA Appeal: 14-1947 Doc: 25 Filed: 02/03/2015 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1947

EDDIE WISE; DOROTHY MONROE-WISE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE; JAMES DAVENPORT, Individually; MIKE HUSKEY, Individually; AARON A. MARTIN, Individually; JUAN M. GARCIA, Individually; TOM VILSACK, In his official capacity as the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture; PAULA F. NICHOLLS, Individually; DEBBIE HOUSTON, Individually; CYNTHIA I. KERNODLE, Individually; JOE LEONARD, In his official capacity as Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights of United States Department of Agriculture,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Terrence W. Boyle, District Judge. (4:13-cv-00234-BO)

Submitted: January 16, 2015 Decided: February 3, 2015

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Eddie Wise, Dorothy Monroe-Wise, Appellants Pro Se. Neal Fowler, Assistant United States Attorney, Thomas Gray Walker,

Appeal: 14-1947 Doc: 25 Filed: 02/03/2015 Pg: 2 of 3

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 14-1947 Doc: 25 Filed: 02/03/2015 Pg: 3 of 3

## PER CURIAM:

Appellants Eddie Wise and Dorothy Monroe-Wise appeal the district court's orders denying their motion for an evidentiary hearing and granting the Defendants' motion to dismiss their civil complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Wise v. U.S. Dep't of Agric., No. 4:13-cv-00234-BO (E.D.N.C. Oct. 27, 2014; Aug. 19, 2014). We grant Appellants leave to proceed in forma pauperis but deny their other pending motions. 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