

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-2378

JEANETTE PERRY-BEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF NORFOLK, a municipal corporation,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

REGINA WILLIAMS, individually and in her official capacity as the City Manager of the City of Norfolk; MELVIN C. HIGH, individually and in his official capacity as the Chief of the City of Norfolk Police Department; CAPTAIN SHARON L. CHAMBERLIN, individually and in her official capacity as a member of the City of Norfolk Police Department; LIEUTENANT C. W. BREWER, individually and in his official capacity as a member of the City of Norfolk Police Department; LIEUTENANT P. S. MIDGETT, individually and in his official capacity as a member of the City of Norfolk Police Department; OFFICER JUDY HASH, individually and in her official capacity as a member of the City of Norfolk Police Department; OFFICER D. J. POWELL, individually and in her official capacity as a member of the City of Norfolk Police Department,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (CA-02-7-2)

Submitted: July 25, 2003

Decided: August 20, 2003

Before TRAXLER, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jeanette Perry-Bey, Appellant Pro Se. Bernard Anthony Pishko, Joan Elizabeth Mahoney, Melvin Wayne Ringer, CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jeanette Perry-Bey appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of her former employer, the City of Norfolk, in her civil action alleging retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3 (2000). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court. See Perry-Bey v. City of Norfolk, No. CA-02-7-2 (E.D. Va. Oct. 31, 2002). 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