

Filed: May 18, 2011

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1895
(1:08-cv-02203-BPG)

MICHELLE MAUPIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM; HOWARD COUNTY BOARD OF
EDUCATION; RESTIA WHITAKER, individually and in his
official capacity; CHRISTIAN J. CALLENDER, individually and
in his official capacity; JOHN L. SEIBEL, individually and
in his official capacity; ROBYN MCDONALD, individually and
in her official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

O R D E R

The Court amends its opinion filed April 1, 2011, as
follows:

On page 2, second line of text -- the words "granting
summary judgment for the defendants" are substituted for the
words "dismissing her civil complaint."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor
Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1895

MICHELLE MAUPIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HOWARD COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM; HOWARD COUNTY BOARD OF
EDUCATION; RESTIA WHITAKER, individually and in his
official capacity; CHRISTIAN J. CALLENDER, individually and
in his official capacity; JOHN L. SEIBEL, individually and
in his official capacity; ROBYN MCDONALD, individually and
in her official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Beth P. Gesner, Magistrate Judge.
(1:08-cv-02203-BPG)

Submitted: March 24, 2011

Decided: April 1, 2011

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michelle Maupin, Appellant Pro Se. Edmund J. O'Meally, Lisa Y.
Settles, HODES, PESSIN & KATZ, PA, Towson, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michelle Maupin appeals the magistrate judge's order granting summary judgment for the defendants.* We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Maupin v. Howard Cnty. Bd. of Educ., No. 1:08-cv-02203-BPG (D. Md. July 15, 2010). 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

* This case was decided by a magistrate judge with the parties' consent pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2006).