

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2336

KIMBERLY A. TUCKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SCHOOL BOARD OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

DR. PATTI JENKINS (individually); MAYNARD MASSEY; VALERIE
WILLIAMS; JAMES MERRILL, Superintendent; BRENDA HARRIS,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief
District Judge. (2:13-cv-00530-RBS-LRL)

Submitted: February 25, 2016

Decided: February 29, 2016

Before SHEDD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kimberly Tucker, Appellant Pro Se. Ann Katherine Sullivan,
SULLIVAN LAW GROUP, PLC, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kimberly A. Tucker appeals from the district court's judgment entered after the district court rejected the magistrate judge's recommendation and granted the School Board of the City of Virginia Beach's summary judgment motion on Tucker's employment discrimination and retaliation claims, brought pursuant to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 701 to 7961 (West 2008 & Supp. 2015); the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 to 12213 (2012); Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000d to 2000d-7 (2012); and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012). Tucker has also filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis, as well as a motion to file attachments to her informal brief.

We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, although we grant Tucker's application to proceed in forma pauperis, we deny Tucker's motion to file attachments to her informal brief and affirm the district court's judgment. See Tucker v. School Bd. VA Beach, No. 2:13-cv-00530-RBS-LRL (E.D. Va. Sept. 30, 2015). 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