

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2158

SUSAN PLOTT STOKES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

AMF BAKERY SYSTEMS; JASON WARD, President and CEO; MONIKA EIDEN, Global HR Director; COLIN POWELL, Global V.P. of Operations; ANTHONY FOX, Director of Operations; KEITH FOLEY, Engineering Manager,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Roderick Charles Young, District Judge. (3:24-cv-00789-RCY)

Submitted: May 21, 2026

Decided: May 26, 2026

Before AGEE and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Susan Plott Stokes, Appellant Pro Se. Broderick Coleman Dunn, DUNN CRAIG & FRANCUZENKO, PLLC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Susan Plott Stokes appeals the district court’s order granting Defendants’ motions to dismiss Stokes’ complaint alleging that her employment was terminated because of her gender, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Baltimore City, Md.*, 163 F.4th 808, 815 (4th Cir. 2026) (recognizing that “[a] claim of discrimination in the enforcement of employee disciplinary measures by reference to a comparator requires that the plaintiff’s prohibited conduct was comparable in seriousness to the misconduct of employees outside the protected class,” and analyzing whether plaintiff adequately alleged that she was similarly situated to comparators, including whether the comparators “held the same job description” and “were subject to the same standards” (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Fry v. Rand Constr. Corp.*, 964 F.3d 239, 248 (4th Cir. 2020) (reiterating that “[i]t is the perception of the decision maker which is relevant” in determining whether discipline is justified, “not the self-assessment of the plaintiff” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s order. *Stokes v. AMF Bakery Sys.*, No. 3:24-cv-00789-RCY (E.D. Va. Aug. 26, 2025). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED