

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1943

RONNIE MONK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PATRICK R. DONAHOE, Postmaster General, United States Postal
Service,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Mark S. Davis, District
Judge. (4:09-cv-00073-MSD-DEM)

Submitted: December 21, 2010

Decided: January 13, 2011

Before MOTZ, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Ronnie Monk, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Elston, Litigation
Counsel, UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE, Washington, D.C.; George
Maralan Kelley, III, Assistant United States Attorney, Norfolk,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Monk appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of the Postmaster General of the United States Postal Service on Monk's employment discrimination claims, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2006). We have reviewed the record and find that the district court did not commit reversible error when it granted summary judgment. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order.* See Monk v. Potter, No. 4:09-cv-00073-MSD-DEM (E.D. Va. June 15, 2010). 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

* Because a litigant in a civil action has no constitutional or statutory right to effective assistance of counsel, Sanchez v. United States Postal Serv., 785 F.2d 126, 127 (5th Cir. 1986), we decline to consider Monk's claim of ineffective assistance of counsel. We also reject Monk's claim that the Postal Service violated its own procedural rules when it disciplined him for tardiness, unauthorized overtime, and unauthorized leave because Monk raises the claim for the first time on appeal. See Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993).