Dismissed by Supreme Court, November 28, 2016

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2083

HAROLD HAMILTON HODGE, JR.; CHANTE' NICOLE HODGE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

COLLEGE OF SOUTHERN MARYLAND (CSM); DR. BRADLEY M. GOTTFRIED, President of CSM; SUE SUBOCZ, VP of Academics Affairs Math Dept.; LORETTA MCGRATH; RICHARD B. FLEMING; JEFFREY POTTER; RICHARD WELSH; MATTHEW SCHATZ; RICARDO "DOE"; CHARLES "DOE", CSM Computer Tech; CALVERT COUNTY LOCAL GOVERNMENT, Official and Unofficial capacity; CHARLES COUNTY LOCAL GOVERNMENT, Official and Unofficial capacity; STATE OF MARYLAND, Official and Unofficial capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:14-cv-02829-DKC)

Submitted: March 18, 2016 Decided: April 22, 2016

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Harold H. Hodge, Jr., Chante' N. Hodge, Appellants Pro Se. Steven David Frenkil, MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, PC, Baltimore, Maryland; John Francis Breads, Jr., Hanover, Maryland; Carl N.

Zacarias, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Harold H. Hodge, Jr., and Chante' N. Hodge appeal from the district court's orders granting the Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) motions of Defendants and dismissing the Hodges' civil action and denying their Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Hodge v. Coll. of S. Md., No. 8:14-cv-02829-DKC (D. Md. Aug. 3 & Sept. 4, 2015).* 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

* We also reject as without merit the Hodges' appellate challenge to the district court's failure to recuse itself. See United States v. Cherry, 330 F.3d 658, 665 (4th Cir. 2003).