

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-1815**

---

CLAUDE HOLLAND,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

LORI HOLLAND,

Plaintiff,

v.

STATE OF MARYLAND; R. HUNTER NELMS; ROBERT VAN METER, Major,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WICOMICO COUNTY, MARYLAND,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (1:06-cv-01649-AMD)

---

Submitted: September 30, 2010

Decided: November 2, 2010

---

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robin R. Cockey, COCKEY, BRENNAN & MALONEY, P.C., Salisbury, Maryland, for Appellant. Douglas F. Gansler, Attorney General, H. Scott Curtis, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Claude Holland filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) action alleging violations of his First and Fourteenth Amendment rights regarding his termination from the Wicomico County Sheriff's Department. The district court denied relief on both claims. On appeal, we affirmed the denial of Holland's First Amendment claim but vacated and remanded to the district court for further proceedings regarding Holland's Fourteenth Amendment reputational claim made under the Supreme Court's opinion in Bd. of Regents v. Roth, 408 U.S. 564 (1972), and related cases. See Holland v. Maryland, 307 Fed. App'x 746, 2009 WL 122575 (4th Cir. 2009) (No. 08-1308).

On remand, the district court granted summary judgment to Defendants, finding that Holland's reputational claim failed because the statements to the press regarding Holland were true. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Holland v. Maryland, No. 1:06-cv-01649-AMD (D. Md. July 2, 2009). 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