

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-1925**

---

WILLIAM T. GRAY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KIM BAGLEY, Prince George County Maryland Public Schools;  
EMORY WATERS, Prince George County Maryland Public Schools;  
CURTIS EUGENE, Prince George County Maryland Public  
Schools; ROSELYN HAWKINS, Prince George County Maryland  
Public Schools; SYNTHIA SHILLING, Prince George County  
Maryland Public Schools; KAREN H. REMINGTON, Prince George  
County Maryland Public Schools; DENNIS P. MURPHY, Maryland  
Department of Public Safety and Correction Services, Police  
and Corrections Training Commissions; ALBERT LIEBNO,  
Maryland Department of Public Safety and Correction  
Services, Police and Corrections Training Commissions;  
DENNIS P. MURPHY, Maryland Department of Public Safety and  
Correction Services, Police and Corrections Training  
Commissions; DANIEL J. ROE, Maryland Department of Public  
Safety and Correction Services, Police and Corrections  
Training Commissions; MARTIN O'MALLEY, Governor, State of  
Maryland,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District  
Judge. (8:11-cv-01117-JFM)

---

Submitted: January 25, 2012

Decided: February 9, 2012

---

Before AGEE and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William T. Gray, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Judah Baror, Linda Hitt Thatcher, THATCHER LAW FIRM, Greenbelt, Maryland; Stuart Milton Nathan, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Pikesville, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William T. Gray seeks to appeal the district court's orders granting the Defendants' Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss his complaint and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion and motion for recusal. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in Gray's informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Gray's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's denial of his motion to recuse, Gray has forfeited appellate review of that order.<sup>1</sup>

Turning to the orders denying relief under Rules 12(b)(6) and 59(e), we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Gray's motions for summary disposition<sup>2</sup> and affirm the district court's orders for the reasons stated by the district court. See Gray v. Bagley, No. 8:11-cv-01117-JFM (D. Md. July 28, 2011 & Aug. 9, 2011). We

---

<sup>1</sup> In any event, we note that Gray's motion to recuse does not assert any facts that raise any question regarding the impartiality of the experienced district court judge. Rather, fairly read, Gray's assertion of bias is entirely predicated on Gray's dissatisfaction with the district court's rulings and management of the litigation. Thus, even had Gray properly preserved appellate review of the denial of his recusal motion, we would have no difficulty rejecting the claim on its merits.

<sup>2</sup> To the extent Gray moves for summary disposition against some Appellees for failure to file a response brief, we decline to grant such a motion. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (noting that Appellees are permitted, but not required, to file response brief).

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