

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-1793

M. MAUREEN POLSBY, M.D.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

THOMAS CHASE, Dr.; IRWIN J. KOPLIN, Dr.; MARK HALLETT, Dr.; DANIEL R. WEINBERGER, Dr.; GIOVANNI DICHIRO, Dr.; MARINOS DALAKIS, Dr.; RICHARD E. CARSON, Dr.; MURRAY GOLDSTEIN, Dr., in his official capacity as Director of the National Institute of Neurologic and Communicative Disorders and Stroke; JAMES B. WYNGAARDEN, Dr., in his official capacity as Director of the National Institute of Health; DONNA E. SHALALA, SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (CA-88-2344-DKC, CA-94-3078, CA-93-3857)

Submitted: September 29, 1998

Decided: October 21, 1998

Before WILKINS, HAMILTON, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

M. Maureen Polsby, Appellant Pro Se. Kathleen McDermott, OFFICE OF
THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

M. Maureen Polsby, M.D., appeals from the district court's final order granting judgment in favor of the Defendants in her employment discrimination action under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended. With respect to Polsby's claims of discrimination occurring during her employment at the National Institutes of Health, our review of the record discloses no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Polsby v. Chase, Nos. CA-88-2344-DKC; CA-94-3078; CA-93-3857 (D. Md. Mar. 29, 1996).

Polsby's claims regarding post-employment acts of retaliation were dismissed by the district court on the basis of this Court's decision in Robinson v. Shell Oil, 70 F.3d 325 (4th Cir. 1995) (en banc). The Supreme Court reversed this decision while Polsby's appeal was pending. See Robinson v. Shell Oil, 519 U.S. 337 (1997). Nevertheless, any error in applying the former standard was harmless as our review of the record reveals that the evidence failed to support her claims of post-employment retaliation. Accordingly, we affirm the dismissal of these claims as well. We grant Polsby's motion to supplement her informal brief, deny her motion to place her appeal in abeyance, and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the mate-

rials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED