

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1325

SHARON THOMAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF NC; UNIVERSITY OF NC; UNIVERSITY OF NC BOARD OF GOVERNORS; UNIVERSITY OF NC AT CHAPEL HILL; UNC HEALTH CARE SYSTEM; ORANGE COUNTY GOVERNMENT; ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES; BEVERLY PERDUE, Individually and Official Capacity; ROY COOPER, Individually and Official Capacity; ERSKINE B. BOWLES, Individually and Official Capacity; THOMAS W. ROSS, Individually and Official Capacity; HANNAH D. GAGE, Individually and Official Capacity; HOLDEN THOPE, Individually and Official Capacity; BRENDA RICHARDSON MALONE, Individually and Official Capacity; JOHN M. THORP, JR., Individually and Official Capacity; CONNIE RENZ, Individually and Official Capacity; ZACONJI TITUS, Individually and Official Capacity; LAURIE T. CHAREST, Individually and Official Capacity; NANCY CONSTON, Individually and Official Capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, Chief District Judge. (3:12-cv-00038-FDW-DSC)

Submitted: August 29, 2013

Decided: September 3, 2013

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sharon Thomas, Appellant Pro Se. Gary Robert Govert, Assistant Solicitor, Raleigh, North Carolina; Rajeev K. Premakumar, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Sonny Sade Haynes, James R. Morgan, Jr., WOMBLE CARLYLE SANDRIDGE & RICE, PLLC, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sharon Thomas appeals the district court's order granting the defendants' motion for reconsideration and dismissing her complaint in part for failing to state a claim and in part for failing to timely serve process. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we grant Thomas leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Thomas v. North Carolina, No. 3:12-cv-00038-FDW-DSC (W.D.N.C. Feb. 13, 2013). 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