

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-1592**

---

DARRELL P. HARRIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

POLICE NATHAN ULMER, in both his official and individual capacity as a Police of the Baltimore City Police Department; SERGEANT NATALIE PRESTON, in both her official and individual capacity as a Police of the Baltimore City Police Department,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

BALTIMORE CITY POLICE DEPARTMENT; ANTHONY W. BATTS, in his official capacity as Commissioner of the Baltimore City Police Department; 6 UNKNOWN POLICE & K9 DOG, in both their official and individual capacity as a Police of the Baltimore City Police Department; MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE CITY; STEPHANIE RAWLINGS-BLAKE, in both their official and individual capacities; GOVERNOR AND THE STATE OF MARYLAND; GOVERNOR MARTIN O'MALLEY, in both his official and individual capacity as Governor,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District Judge. (1:14-cv-02470-JFM)

---

Submitted: September 13, 2016

Decided: September 16, 2016

---

Before TRAXLER, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Darrell P. Harris, Appellant Pro Se. Frederic Nelson Smalkin,  
Jr., Assistant Solicitor, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Darrell P. Harris appeals the district court's order granting Defendants summary judgment on his civil rights claims against them. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny as moot Harris' motion for stay of the district court proceedings pending appeal, deny Appellees' motion to strike Harris' motion for stay, and affirm the district court's order. Harris v. Ulmer, No. 1:14-cv-02470-JFM (D. Md. filed May 6, 2016, entered May 9, 2016). 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