

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1413

YVETT C. RUDOLPH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BUNCOMBE COUNTY GOVERNMENT; AMANDA STONE; MARTIN PHILLIPS,
"Marty"; ANN LUNSFORD,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Martin K. Reidinger,
District Judge. (1:10-cv-00203-MR-DLH)

Submitted: July 31, 2012

Decided: August 14, 2012

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yvett C. Rudolph, Appellant Pro Se. Thomas Joseph Doughton, Amy
Lynn Rich, DOUGHTON & RICH, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yvett Rudolph appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of Buncombe County Department of Social Services, Amanda Stone, Martin Phillips, and Ann Lunsford (collectively, "Appellees") in Rudolph's employment discrimination suit. We affirm.

As a preliminary matter, we note that Rudolph's informal brief makes reference to the transcript of the summary judgment hearing. This transcript has not been included in the record on appeal. An appellant has the burden of including in the record on appeal a transcript of all parts of the proceedings material to the issues raised on appeal. Fed. R. App. P. 10(b); 4th Cir. R. 10(c). An appellant proceeding on appeal in forma pauperis is entitled to transcripts at government expense only in certain circumstances. 28 U.S.C. § 753(f) (2006). Even assuming Rudolph properly sought preparation of the transcript at government's expense, we conclude that she has not made the requisite showing, and accordingly deny her request. See Liteky v. United States, 510 U.S. 540, 555-56 (1994); see generally Fed. R. App. P. 10(b)(2); Keller v. Prince George's Cnty., 827 F.2d 952, 954 n.1 (4th Cir. 1987).

Turning to Rudolph's substantive claims, she asserts that the district court exhibited bias against her. However,

this claim is, in essence, a reflection of Rudolph's dissatisfaction with the district court's substantive rulings. Rudolph's pleadings and the available record – including the court's thorough and well-reasoned orders and opinion – provide no basis for concluding that the district court or magistrate judge exhibited any bias against Rudolph. See Liteky, 510 U.S. at 555-56. As to Rudolph's remaining arguments on appeal, we have thoroughly reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's grant of summary judgment to Appellees and the imposition of costs.

We deny Rudolph's motion to supplement the record. We decline Appellees' request to enjoin Rudolph from filing further proceedings without permission. 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