

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1548

JAMES H. HOWELL; ROBERT S. MARSHALL; GLENROY SCHISLER;
RICHARD A. YOUNG,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

JACK RUSHING,

Plaintiff,

v.

TRUCK DRIVERS AND HELPERS LOCAL UNION NO. 355; DRIVERS,
CHAUFFEURS AND HELPERS LOCAL UNION NO. 639; TEAMSTERS 639
EMPLOYERS PENSION TRUST FUND; TEAMSTERS 355 EMPLOYERS
PENSION TRUST FUND; JOINT BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF TEAMSTERS 639
EMPLOYERS PENSION TRUST FUND; JOINT BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF
TEAMSTERS 355 EMPLOYERS PENSION TRUST FUND; PHILIP FEASTER,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS; TEAMSTERS JOINT
COUNCIL NO. 55; UNITED PARCEL SERVICE, INCORPORATED,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District
Judge. (1:07-cv-00989-WDQ)

Submitted: December 10, 2008

Decided: January 23, 2009

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James H. Howell; Robert S. Marshall; Glenroy Schissler; Richard A. Young, Appellants Pro Se. Helene Victoria Hedian, Paul Douglas Starr, Kimberly Lynn Bradley, ABATO, RUBENSTEIN & ABATO, PA, Baltimore, Maryland; Mark James Murphy, MOONEY, GREEN, BAKER & SAINDON, PC, Washington, D.C.; Donald Lawrence Havermann, Simon Joseph Torres, MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP, Washington, D.C.; Jason Lee Levine, JOSEPH, GREENWALD & LAAKE, PA, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal the district court's order denying their motion for reconsideration of the court's order granting Appellees' motions to dismiss, granting the remaining Appellee's motion for judgment on the pleadings, and denying relief on Appellants' civil complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm substantially for the reasons stated by the district court. See Howell v. Truck Drivers & Helpers Local Union No. 355, No. 1:07-cv-00989-WDQ (D. Md. Apr. 9, 2008; Jan. 8, 2008). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED