

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1223

KATARINA ELLIS, on her own behalf and on the
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, Division of
Rehabilitation Services; NANCY G. GRASMICK,
State Superintendent, individually and in her
official capacity; ROBERT A. BURNS, Assistant
State Superintendent, individually and in his
official capacity; DIANE PAWLOWICZ, Director,
individually and in her official capacity;
PATRICK W. MCKENNA, Director, individually and
in his official capacity; RHODORA TUMANON,
State Medical Director, individually and in
her official capacity; DOUGLAS SILVERMAN, Di-
rector, individually and in his official
capacity; PECOLIA BLACKWELL, Director, indi-
vidually and in her official capacity; ELLEN
C. NICHOLS, Director, individually and in her
official capacity; SHARON JULIUS, Director,
individually and in her official capacity;
RONALD WINTER, Supervisor, individually and in
his official capacity; DAVID HUME, Supervisor,
individually and in his official capacity;
PAMELA J. MCCALIP, Rehabilitation Specialist,
individually and in her official capacity; J.
MICHAEL BREEDEN, Rehabilitation Specialist,
individually and in his official capacity;
KATHY SETARO, Rehabilitation Specialist, indi-
vidually and in her official capacity; SUSAN
T. COOPER, Rehabilitation Specialist, individ-
ually and in her official capacity; BRUCE
BAILEY, Rehabilitation Technologist, individ-
ually and in his official capacity; DARRIN C.
HARRISON, Rehabilitation Technologist, indi-

vidually and in his official capacity; DEBORAH DUNN, Rehabilitation Technologist, individually and in her official capacity; J. STEPHANIE WOERNER, Rehabilitation Technologist, individually and in her official capacity; E. C. TOWNSEND, Supervisor, individually and in his official capacity; LYNN HANO ALBIZO, Esquire, individually and in her official capacity; J. JOSEPH CURRAN, JR., Attorney General, State of Maryland, Office of the Attorney General, individually and in his official capacity; MARGARET ANN NOLAN, Assistant Attorney General, individually and in her official capacity; DANA MURRAY, Assistant Attorney General, individually and in his official capacity; REGINA DIEM, Rehabilitation Specialist, individually and in her own capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Frederic N. Smalkin, District Judge. (CA-98-3708-S)

Submitted: October 20, 1999 Decided: November 10, 1999

Before MURNAGHAN and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Katarina Ellis, Appellant Pro Se. JoAnn Grozuczak Goedert, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Charles Martinez, Michael Richard Severino, ECCLESTON & WOLF, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

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

PER CURIAM:

Katarina Ellis filed suit against several individuals and agencies alleging various civil rights violations, including a violation of 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999), The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the First, Fifth, and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution.

Ellis now appeals the district court's orders: (1) denying her motion for appointment of counsel; (2) denying her motion to proceed on appeal under pseudonym and motion to seal her statement of facts and exhibits; (3) denying a letter received from her friend construed as a motion for reconsideration; (4) granting in part Defendant Lynn Hano Albizo's motion to dismiss and granting in part Albizo's motion for summary judgment; (5) granting in part her "motion for an increase in number of pages for answer memorandum and permission to number lines," but denying her motion for an extension of time to file a response to State Defendants' motion for summary judgment; (6) denying her request to order the Division of Rehabilitation Services of the Maryland State Department of Education to move her records to a branch near her residence and permit her to review her files during normal business hours and denying her motion to have defense counsel provide their documents in alternative audio format; (7) denying her motion for reconsideration of various interlocutory orders and denying her motion for recusal; and (8) granting State Defendants' motion for summary

judgment and dismissing the case with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i) (West Supp. 1999).

We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Ellis v. Maryland Dep't of Educ., No. CA-98-3708-S (D. Md. Nov. 13, Nov. 20 & Dec. 17, 1998; Feb. 9, Feb. 18, Feb. 22, Mar. 3 & Mar. 16, 1999). 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