

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1529

LEONARD E. VINES,

Petitioner,

v.

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY; BENEFITS
REVIEW BOARD; DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION
PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

Respondents.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Benefits Review Board
(12-0280).

Submitted: September 20, 2013

Decided: October 3, 2013

Before WILKINSON and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Leonard E. Vines, Petitioner Pro Se. Malcolm Luis-Harper,
Washington, D.C.; Sara Olivia Rollman, Washington, D.C.; Gerard
J. Stief, Associate General Counsel, WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN
AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY, Washington, D.C.; Rae Ellen James,
Deputy Solicitor, Rebecca Jayne Fiebig, Washington, D.C., Daniel
Sarno, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, Newport News,
Virginia; Thomas O. Shepherd, Jr., BENEFITS REVIEW BOARD,
Washington, D.C., for Respondents.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Leonard E. Vines seeks review of the Benefits Review Board's decision and order affirming the administrative law judge's grant of the employer's motion for summary dismissal, and its order denying Vines' subsequent motion for reconsideration. Vines sought to challenge a 1979 settlement under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act ("LHWCA"), 33 U.S.C. § 901-950, extended to District of Columbia Workers by the District of Columbia Workman's Compensation Act of 1928. D.C. Code §§ 36-501 to 36-503 (1973) (repealed 1982). Our review of the record discloses that the Board's decision is based upon substantial evidence and is without reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Vines' motion for appointment of counsel, and deny the petition for review for the reasons stated by the Board. Vines v. Washington Metro. Area Transit Auth., No. 12-0280 (B.R.B. Jan. 25 & Mar. 7, 2013). 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.

PETITION DENIED