

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 18-1735

GLENN MYER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SUSAN STONEY; COUNTY OF FAIRFAX GOVERNMENT; SHARON
BULOVA, Chairman of County of Fairfax; HON. MICHAEL JOSEPH CASSIDY,
Presiding Judge, Chief Judge; OMAR MERCEDES; CHRISTOPHER BARR;
TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT, Fairfax County Courthouse,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:18-cv-00722-LMB-MSN)

Submitted: December 28, 2018

Decided: February 8, 2019

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, THACKER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Glenn Myer, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Glenn Myer appeals the district court's order dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1985 (2012) action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. While the district court may have erred in concluding that Myer's claim against Christopher Barr was barred by quasijudicial immunity, *see McCray v. Maryland*, 456 F.2d 1, 4 (4th Cir. 1972) (holding that quasi-judicial immunity does not extend to clerk's performance of "required ministerial act[s] such as properly filing papers"), its conclusion that Myer failed to allege that Barr conspired to violate Myer's civil rights is well-supported. The district court also erroneously determined that the County of Fairfax Government ("the County") was not subject to suit. *See* Va. Code Ann. § 15.2-1404 (2018) ("Every locality may sue or be sued in its own name in relation to all matters connected with its duties."). But, the court properly found that Myer did not sufficiently allege that the County was involved in a conspiracy to violate his civil rights. With respect to the remainder of Myer's claims, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Myer v. Stoney*, No. 1:18-cv-00722-LMB-MSN (E.D. Va. June 21, 2018). We grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis. 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