

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

VICTORIA ELAINE BROCK,

Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,
MARYLAND; RICHARD J. WELSH,

Major, Prince George's County

Police Department; TERESA C.

CHAMBERS, Major, Prince George's

County Police Department; MARK

A. WRIGHT, Major, Prince George's

County Police Department;

ORLANDO D. BARNES, Major, Prince

George's County Police

Department; WILLIAM A. RICHARDS,

Captain, Prince George's County

Police Department,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 99-2254

VICTORIA ELAINE BROCK,
Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY,
MARYLAND; RICHARD J. WELSH,
Major, Prince George's County
Police Department; TERESA C.
CHAMBERS, Major, Prince George's

No. 99-2332

County Police Department; MARK
A. WRIGHT, Major, Prince George's
County Police Department;
ORLANDO D. BARNES, Major, Prince
George's County Police
Department; WILLIAM A. RICHARDS,
Captain, Prince George's County
Police Department,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Catherine C. Blake, District Judge.
(CA-98-122-CCB)

Submitted: August 31, 2000

Decided: September 18, 2000

Before WILKINS, MICHAEL, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

James Brewster Hopewell, Riverdale, Maryland, for Appellant. Sean D. Wallace, County Attorney, John A. Bielec, Deputy County Attorney, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Victoria Elaine Brock, an African-American female, filed suit against her employer, Prince George's County Police Department, and five employees alleging racial and sexual discrimination, sexual harassment, and retaliation in violation of Title VII of the Civil Right Act, due process violations, racial discrimination under 42 U.S.C.A. § 1981 (1994), and state law claims for intentional infliction of emotional distress, invasion of privacy, breach of contract, and tortious interference. The court entered summary judgment against Brock and dismissed the action. Brock now appeals that order and two subsequent orders denying her "motion to revise memorandum" and awarding a bill of costs in favor of Defendants in the amount of \$4,043.05. We affirm.

On appeal, Brock alleges that the district court improperly granted summary judgment on her unlawful racial and sexual discrimination, retaliation, and sexual harassment claims. We review a grant of summary judgment de novo. See Higgins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment is appropriate only if there are no material facts in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). We must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986).

We have carefully reviewed the written submissions in light of this standard and find that the district court's thorough opinion was well-reasoned. Finding no reversible error, we affirm the district court's orders on the reasoning of the district court. (J.A. at 46-59). 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