

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

FRANCINE ROBERTS,

Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

No. 99-1262

RODNEY SLATER, SECRETARY,
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.
Claude M. Hilton, Chief District Judge.
(CA-98-736)

Submitted: August 24, 1999

Decided: September 20, 1999

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Terrell N. Roberts, III, ROBERTS & WOOD, Riverdale, Maryland,
for Appellant. Helen F. Fahey, United States Attorney, Rachel C. Bal-
low, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiff Francine Roberts appeals from the district court's decision granting summary judgment in favor of Defendant Rodney Slater, Secretary of Transportation, on her claim of sexual harassment. The court ruled that there were no material facts in dispute with respect to whether the conduct at issue amounted to harassment and whether Roberts's employer provided an effective remedy. We agree with the court's ruling on the latter issue; accordingly, we do not reach the first issue, and we affirm.

The record indicates that Roberts's co-worker subjected her to inappropriate comments and gestures over a period of three months, with the misconduct increasing in intensity over that period. When she and other victims of the same co-worker advised their supervisor of his conduct, the co-worker was reprimanded and transferred to another location, thus depriving him of the opportunity to continue mistreating Roberts. This remedy stopped the improper conduct and therefore was sufficient as a matter of law. See Spicer v. Virginia Dep't of Corrections, 66 F.3d 705, 711 (4th Cir. 1995); cf. Burlington Indus., Inc. v. Ellerth, 118 S. Ct. 2257, 2270-71 (1998). Thus, the grant of summary judgment in favor of the Defendant was proper. 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