

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

KANDY DEADWYLER-AGUBUZO,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

GREATER CHESAPEAKE AND POTOMAC
BLOOD SERVICES REGION OF THE
AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Defendant-Appellee,

and

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Defendant.

No. 01-1148

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Frederic N. Smalkin, District Judge.
(CA-00-1104)

Submitted: June 8, 2001

Decided: August 2, 2001

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER,
Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

H. Vincent McKnight, Jr., Sidney Schupak, Washington, D.C., for
Appellant. Robert G. Ames, Jeffrey P. Ayres, Sharon L. Ball, VEN-

ABLE, BAETJER & HOWARD, L.L.P., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Kandy Deadwyler-Agubuzo appeals the district court's order entering summary judgment in favor of the Greater Chesapeake & Potomac Blood Services Region of the American Red Cross ("Red Cross") in this employment discrimination action. Agubuzo's suit alleged hostile work environment, in violation of Title VII, and intentional infliction of emotional distress, in violation of Maryland law. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

First, we find that Agubuzo failed to show that she subjectively perceived the environment to be abusive. *See Harris v. Forklift Sys., Inc.*, 510 U.S. 17, 21-22 (1993). Moreover, we find that Agubuzo has not produced sufficient evidence to impute liability to the Red Cross. *See Faragher v. City of Boca Raton*, 524 U.S. 775, 807 (1998). Finally, we have reviewed the portion of the district court's order granting summary judgment on Agubuzo's intentional infliction of emotional distress claim, and we find it to be without reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the dismissal of this claim on the reasoning of the district court. *Deadwyler-Agubuzo v. Greater Chesapeake & Potomac Blood Servs.*, No. CA-00-1104 (D. Md. Dec. 29, 2000).

We, therefore, affirm the grant of summary judgment to the Red Cross. 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