

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-6621

DANTE LINTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DAVID CHEUVRONT, II, Sergeant; UNKNOWN AGENT -
BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT; JEFFREY SILK;
ROBERT STANTON, Lieutenant; BALTIMORE POLICE
DEPARTMENT; U.S. DRUG ENFORCEMENT AGENCY;
UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Richard D. Bennett, District Judge. (CA-
03-99-RDB; CA-03-937-RDB)

Submitted: October 20, 2005

Decided: October 26, 2005

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dante Linton, Appellant Pro Se. Neal Marcellas Janey, Sr.,
Baltimore, Maryland; Allen F. Loucks, Assistant United States
Attorney, John Walter Sippel, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES
ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland; Michael Allan Fry, Assistant
Solicitor, BALTIMORE POLICE DEPARTMENT, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Dante Linton appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of the federal defendants in his action seeking return of property under Fed. R. Crim. P. 41(g).^{*} We have reviewed the record, including the transcript of the hearing held on February 28, 2005, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court at the hearing. See Linton v. Chevront, Nos. CA-03-99-RDB; CA-03-937-RDB (D. Md. filed Feb. 28, 2005 & entered Mar. 2, 2005). 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

^{*}Linton does not challenge on appeal the district court's disposition of the claims against the state defendants. He therefore has waived appellate review of any issue related to those defendants. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief.").