

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 26-1054**

---

ASHLEY BOSHEA, Administrator of the Estate of David John Boshea, Deceased,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

and

COMPASS MARKETING, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee,

v.

MICHAEL R. WHITE,

Movant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
Ellen Lipton Hollander, Senior District Judge. (1:21-cv-00309-ELH)

---

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 28, 2026

---

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael R. White, Appellant Pro Se. Stephen B. Stern, KAGAN STERN MARINELLO &  
BEARD, LLC, Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellee Compass Marketing, Inc.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael R. White appeals a district court order denying his motion for sanctions against the appellees, Compass Marketing, Inc., and its lawyers. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. As the district court explained, Michael may not recover sanctions under Rule 11 because he failed to comply with Rule 11's "safe harbor" provision, which requires that a motion for sanctions be served on the opposing party at least twenty-one days before it is filed in court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. Moreover, White's motion for sanctions under Rule 11 and other provisions was untimely, as the alleged misconduct occurred two years before White filed his motion.

White also appeals the district court's denial of his motion for reconsideration. But in his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion, White failed to identify any errors in the district court's underlying order or to provide additional evidence that would affect the court's analysis. Finally, White has filed motions to amend the captions and to prohibit the dismissal of a related appeal in which White is not a party. We deny these motions and affirm the district court's orders. *Boshea v. Compass Mktg., Inc.*, No. 1:21-cv-00309-ELH D. Md. (Oct. 30, 2025 & Jan. 29, 2026). 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*