

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 97-1333**

---

BERNARD J. SCHULTE, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, and derivatively on behalf of Oxford Tax Exempt Fund Limited Partnership; GEORGE A. CRAIG, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

versus

OXFORD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION; LEO E. ZICKLER; OXFORD TAX EXEMPT FUND I CORPORATION; OXFORD FUND II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; OXFORD INVESTMENT CORPORATION; OXFORD INVESTMENT II CORPORATION; OXFORD EQUITIES CORPORATION; OXFORD TAX EXEMPT FUND II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; OXFORD TAX EXEMPT FUND LIMITED PARTNERSHIP; OXFORD TAX EXEMPT FUND II CORPORATION, a Maryland Corporation; OXFORD REALTY FINANCIAL GROUP, INCORPORATED, a Maryland Corporation; OXFORD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, a Maryland Corporation; OXFORD BETHESDA II LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, a Maryland limited partnership,

Defendants - Appellees,

versus

JOAN KING, Individually and as state class representative,

Movant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, District Judge. (CA-95-3643-WMN)

---

Submitted: February 10, 1998                      Decided: February 24, 1998

---

Before MURNAGHAN, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Joan King, Appellant Pro Se. Charles Juster Piven, LAW OFFICE OF CHARLES J. PIVEN, Baltimore, Maryland; Kenneth George Gilman, David Pastor, GILMAN & PASTOR, Boston, Massachusetts; Daniel Charles Girard, GIRARD & GREEN, P.C., San Francisco, California; Andrew Bennett Weissman, Robert Franklin Hoyt, Robert Bruce McCaw, WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING, Washington, D.C.; Charles Jay Landy, SHAW, PITTMAN, POTTS & TROWBRIDGE, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order approving the settlement agreement in this securities fraud class action suit. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Schulte v. King, No. CA-95-3643-WMN (D. Md. Feb. 23, 1997); see In re Jiffy Lube Securities Litig., 927 F.2d 155 (4th Cir. 1991); Flinn v. FMC Corp., 528 F.2d 1169 (4th Cir. 1975). 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