

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-2059

CHARLES H. CARTER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

LOUIS HOPSON; ZEINAB RABOLD; JOHN M. MACK; JACQUES BONAPARTE; MELVIN RUSSELL; CHRISTINE BOYD; CARLOS PERRY; ANTHONY GOODE; LESLIE EDWARDS; MICHAEL FARRAR; EDWARD TINDEL; LYNELL GREEN; SHIRLEY ONYANGO; ANTHONY ELLISON; EXDOL WILLIAMS; MICHAEL EDWARDS; ERICA FOOTE; ANTOINE TRAVERS; KAREN ALSTON; MAURICE PRICE; LOUIS H. HOPSON, JR.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, a municipal corporation of the State of Maryland,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

CITY OF BALTIMORE; MARTIN O'MALLEY, Mayor of the City of Baltimore; LEONARD HAMM, Police Commissioner for the City of Baltimore; EDWARD T. NORRIS, JR., Former Police Commissioner for the City of Baltimore; THOMAS FRAZIER, Former Police Commissioner for the City of Baltimore; SEAN R. MALONE, Labor Commissioner for the City of Baltimore; MARIA KORMAN, Trial Board Counsel for the Baltimore City Police Department; GARY MAY, Former Legal Affairs Director for the Baltimore City Police Department, in their official capacities; LEONARD D. HAMM, Acting Police Commissioner,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:04-cv-03842-WDQ)

Submitted: March 19, 2015

Decided: March 27, 2015

Before WILKINSON, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles H. Carter, Appellant Pro Se. Gary Gilkey, Assistant Solicitor, Suzanne Sangree, George Albert Nilson, BALTIMORE CITY LAW DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Charles H. Carter appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying Carter's motion, which was construed as a motion for contempt in relation to a settlement agreement that the court had previously approved. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Carter v. Baltimore City Police Dep't, No. 1:04-cv-03842-WDQ (D. Md. Sept. 16, 2014). We grant Carter leave to proceed on appeal 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