

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1061

CAROLYN J. MELVIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF GREENVILLE; DAVID BEST, in his individual and official capacity; HOWARD CONNER, in his individual and official capacity; CECIL HARDY, in his individual and official capacity; CHARLES HINMAN, in his individual and official capacity; JOSEPH M. SIMONOWICH, in his individual and official capacity; JOHN TEEL, in his individual and official capacity; CITY OF GREENVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Malcolm J. Howard, District Judge. (CA-96-66-4-H)

Submitted: June 29, 1999

Decided: July 15, 1999

Before WILLIAMS, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carolyn J. Melvin, Appellant Pro Se. David A. Holec, M. Blair Carr, CITY OF GREENVILLE, Greenville, North Carolina; David Powell

Stillerman, Jr., Laurence S. Graham, GRAHAM & STILLERMAN, P.A.,
Greenville, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Carolyn J. Melvin appeals the district court's order accepting in part a magistrate judge's recommendation and granting Defendants' motion for summary judgment in an action brought for violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983, 1985, 1986 (1994), for constructive discharge, and for violation of the North Carolina Equal Employment Practices Act and public policy, and for intentional infliction of emotional distress. We have reviewed the record, the magistrate judge's memorandum and recommendation, and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Melvin v. City of Greenville, No. CA-96-66-4-H (E.D.N.C. Dec. 7, 1998). 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