

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-1337**

---

IBNOMER M. SHARAFELDIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

STATE OF MARYLAND, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY  
AND CORRECTIONAL SERVICES,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

MARYLAND DIVISION OF CORRECTIONS; SONDERVAN  
WILLIAM, Commissioner Maryland Division of  
Correction; JOHN MICHAEL STOUFFER, Warden;  
MARYLAND CORRECTIONAL TRAINING CENTER; LARRY  
MCCAULEY, Captain; GARY SMITH, Correctional  
Officer II; NANCY WILLIAMS, Director Religious  
and Volunteer Services; VIVILAN E. FEREBEE,  
E.E.O. Director Department of Public Safety  
and Correctional Services; MARK TROUPE, Cap-  
tain Maryland Division of Correction; STATE OF  
MARYLAND,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. Alexander Harvey II, Senior District  
Judge. (CA-99-2940-H)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2001

Decided: November 15, 2001

---

Before LUTTIG, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Fatai A. Suleman, AMOROW & KUM, P.A., Hyattsville, Maryland, for Appellant. J. Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Scott S. Oakley, Assistant Attorney General, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Ibnomer M. Sharafeldin filed an amended complaint 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). He alleged hostile work environment harassment and constructive discharge arising from his employment as a chaplain at the Maryland Correctional Training Center. Sharafeldin sought leave to file a second amended complaint alleging a failure-to-hire claim. He appeals the district court's denial of this motion and the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of the Appellee.

We have reviewed the parties' briefs and joint appendix and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Sharafeldin v. State of Maryland, No. CA-99-2940-H (D. Md. June 14, 2000; Feb. 13, 2001). 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