**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-1887**

---

DAVID A. BARCROFT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

ALBERT L. LIEBNO, JR., on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated; GEORGE BRUCE HARRISON; JONATHAN L. BEAM; MICHAEL J. COLE; JOHN R. DAVIS; JOHN R. DIGGS, JR.; EDWIN P. KARR; RAYMOND KELLAR; DAVID A. MARTIN; CHARLES MAYS; ROY NOLSON; CHARLES PERTAIN; RANDY RUDY; ROBERT L. SMITH; FRANK WALTERS; THOMAS W. WARDROPE; DOUGLAS M. ZELLER,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

MARYLAND STATE POLICE; DAVID B. MITCHELL, Superintendent Maryland State Police,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 95-1888**

---

DAVID A. BARCROFT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOSEPH A. BARKER, JR.; PHILIP M. BERMAN; JOHN F. BOYD; RICHARD T. BRUNS; CARLETON D. COBB; THOMAS W. COLBERT; KENNETH W. CROSS, JR.; JOSEPH L. DAVIS; DONALD HOLLAWAY; ROSWELL E. JONES; JAMES C. JOYCE; GERRY KEHS; IRVIN LAMBDIN; CHARLES J. LUKOSKI; CHARLES MAYS; FRANK MILLS; RICHARD SHARP; JOHN TALBOT, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated; JOHN R. DIGGS, JR.,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

MARYLAND STATE POLICE; DAVID B. MITCHELL, Superintendent Maryland State Police,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Chief District Judge. (CA-90-925-JFM, CA-92-740-JFM)

---

Submitted: June 20, 1996 Decided: June 27, 1996

---

Before HALL, WILKINS, and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David A. Barcroft, Appellant Pro Se. Michael L. Marshall, SCHLACHMAN, BELSKY & WEINER, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland; Lawrence Paul Fletcher-Hill, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's order approving a class action settlement agreement. 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. Barcroft v. Maryland State Police, Nos. CA-90-925-JFM; CA-92-740-JFM (D. Md. Apr. 5, 1995). 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