## United States Court of Appeals

Sandra H. Harp  Plaintiff - Appellant  v.  Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.; David Ginsberg; Margot McManus; Micki St Clair, as agents for Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.  Defendants - Appellees  Appeal from United States District Court for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  Submitted: January 29, 2014  Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]  Prefere LOVEN BYE and COLLOTON Ginnit Indees	For the Eighth Circuit
Plaintiff - Appellant  v.  Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.; David Ginsberg; Margot McManus; Micki St Clair, as agents for Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.  Defendants - Appellees  Appeal from United States District Court for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  Submitted: January 29, 2014  Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]	No. 13-1930
Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.; David Ginsberg; Margot McManus; Micki St Clair, as agents for Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.  **Defendants - Appellees**  Appeal from United States District Court for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  Submitted: January 29, 2014  Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]  ————	Sandra H. Harp
Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.; David Ginsberg; Margot McManus; Micki St Clair, as agents for Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.  **Defendants - Appellees**  Appeal from United States District Court for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  Submitted: January 29, 2014  Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]  ————	Plaintiff - Appellant
Clair, as agents for Navarre Logistical Services, Inc.  Defendants - Appellees  Appeal from United States District Court for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  Submitted: January 29, 2014  Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]	V.
Appeal from United States District Court for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  Submitted: January 29, 2014 Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]	<u> </u>
for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  ———————————————————————————————————	Defendants - Appellees
for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis  ———————————————————————————————————	
Submitted: January 29, 2014 Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]	Appeal from United States District Court
Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]  —————	for the District of Minnesota - Minneapolis
Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]  —————	<del></del>
Filed: February 7, 2014  [Unpublished]  —————	Submitted: January 29, 2014
	·
Pafora LOVEN DVE and COLLOTON Circuit Judges	[Unpublished]
Pafora LOVEN DVE and COLLOTON Circuit Judges	
before LOKEN, b i E, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.	Before LOKEN, BYE, and COLLOTON, Circuit Judges.
PER CURIAM.	PER CURIAM.

Sandra Harp appeals from the district court's¹ adverse grant of summary judgment in her pro se action claiming that her former employer terminated her based on her race, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Upon careful de novo review, see Olsen v. Capital Region Med. Ctr., 713 F.3d 1149, 1153 (8th Cir. 2013), we conclude that the district court properly granted summary judgment because the admissible evidence before the court would not permit a factfinder to conclude that defendants' proffered reason for firing Harp was pretextual. See Twymon v. Wells Fargo & Co., 462 F.3d 925, 935 (8th Cir. 2006) (plaintiff failed to show proffered reason for termination was pretext where she did not assert that employer did not honestly believe she was accountable for violations of policy when it fired her for those violations).

Accordingly, we	affirm. <u>See</u> 81	th Cir. R. 47B	٠.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Patrick J. Schiltz, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable Franklin L. Noel, United States Magistrate Judge for the District of Minnesota.