

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

ROBERT N. LAPORTE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

JOHN E. POTTER, Postmaster General
of the United States,
Defendant-Appellee.

No. 02-1015

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Peter J. Messitte, District Judge.
(CA-00-3341-PJM)

Submitted: August 13, 2002

Decided: September 4, 2002

Before MICHAEL, TRAXLER, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Joe C. Ashworth, Leonardtown, Maryland, for Appellant. Thomas M. DiBiagio, United States Attorney, Tarra DeShields-Minnis, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Robert N. LaPorte, a United States Post Office employee, appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to John E. Potter, Postmaster General of the United States, in LaPorte's employment discrimination action filed under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 1994 & Supp. 2001).

On appeal, LaPorte argues that the district court erred in holding statements he and his daughter made regarding his frustration with the Post Office were insufficient to substantiate his claims of pain, suffering, and emotional distress, and in so doing, rejecting his prayer for compensatory damages. We review the district court's order de novo, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to LaPorte. *Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986); *Higgins v. E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.*, 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). LaPorte's claim is meritless; the district court did not err in holding that the brief and conclusory statements LaPorte offered failed to substantiate his claim for compensatory damages. *Hetzel v. Prince William County*, 89 F.3d 169, 171 (4th Cir. 1996).

Accordingly, we affirm. 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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED