

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-2659

KAREN SNELL, by and through her parents and
guardians, Lillian and Stephen Snell,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JAMES W. BUFFINGTON; DOYLE R. MYERS; GEORGE J.
BROWN; GERALD BOARMAN; JOHN CESCHINI,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION;
CATHERINE M. BURCH; MARY C. CANAVAN; THOMAS R.
HENDERSHOT; VERNA P. TEASDALE; FREDERICK C.
HUTCHINSON; SUZANNE K. PLOUGMAN,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge.
(CA-93-1184-AW)

Submitted: December 17, 1996

Decided: January 3, 1997

Before ERVIN, HAMILTON, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Matt P. Lavine, College Park, Maryland, for Appellant. Sheldon L. Gnatt, Roger C. Thomas, REICHEL, NUSSBAUM, LAPLACA & MILLER, Greenbelt, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Karen Snell appeals the district court's order granting a directed verdict for the Defendants in her civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1994). Snell, a high school student at the time of the incidents involved, filed this suit alleging that the Defendants violated her constitutional rights by imposing a disciplinary suspension as a result of her admitted involvement with an unauthorized student publication. The district court concluded that Snell had failed to produce sufficient evidence to prevail on her First Amendment claim or her Fourth Amendment claim and that in any event the Defendants were entitled to qualified immunity.

This Court will uphold the district court's entry of a directed verdict if, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, there could be only "one reasonable conclusion as to the verdict" under the applicable law. Alevromagiros v. Hechinger Co., 993 F.2d 417, 420 (4th Cir. 1993) (quoting Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986)). Substantially for the reasons set forth by the district court, we affirm. See Snell v. The Prince George's County Board of Education, No. AW-93-1184 (D.Md. Aug. 11, 1995).

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