

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-2457

RAYMOND J. BLY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CIRCUIT COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY, as an agency and instrumentality of the State of Maryland; WAYNE A. ROBEY, Individually and in his official capacity as Clerk of the Circuit Court for Howard County, MD; HONORABLE LENORE GELFMAN, individually and in her official capacity as Administrative Judge of the Circuit Court for Howard County, MD; J. DOES, One or more individuals sued in his or her or their individual capacities, and in his or her or their respective capacities as state agents or actors directed or knowingly permitted to perpetrate acts and/or omissions knowingly and intentionally violative,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. George L. Russell, III, District Judge; J. Mark Coulson, Magistrate Judge. (1:18-cv-01333-JMC)

Submitted: May 21, 2020

Decided: May 26, 2020

Before AGEE and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Raymond J. Bly, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph Dudek, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY
GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Raymond J. Bly filed a civil action in the district court alleging that the Defendants improperly denied access to court records relating to his 1987 Maryland criminal convictions. Bly appeals (1) the district court's order granting in part the Defendants' motion to dismiss; (2) the magistrate judge's order* granting summary judgment to the Defendants on Bly's First Amendment right of access claim; and (3) the magistrate judge's order denying Bly's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion and his motion for sanctions. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the lower court. *Bly v. Cir. Ct. for Howard Cnty., Md.*, No. 1:18-cv-01333-JMC (D. Md. June 26, 2019, Oct. 9, 2019, & Dec. 4, 2019). 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

* The parties consented to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2018).