

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

AUG 16 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

MARGARET ANN HAUGHTON,

No. 16-35674

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 3:15-cv-00888-HZ

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

MEGAN J. BRENNAN, Postmaster  
General, US Postal Service,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Oregon  
Marco A. Hernandez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 9, 2017\*\*

Before: SCHROEDER, TASHIMA, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Margaret Ann Haughton appeals pro se from the district court's summary judgment in her Title VII action alleging a retaliation claim. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo. *Vasquez v. County of Los Angeles*, 349 F.3d 634, 639 (9th Cir. 2004). We affirm.

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

The district court properly granted summary judgment on Haughton’s retaliatory hostile work environment claim because Haughton failed to raise a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether she was subjected to conduct that was severe or pervasive enough to alter the conditions of her employment. *See Ray v. Henderson*, 217 F.3d 1234, 1240, 1245 (9th Cir. 2000) (“To determine whether an environment is sufficiently hostile, we look to the totality of the circumstances, including the frequency of the discriminatory conduct; its severity; whether it is physically threatening or humiliating, or a mere offensive utterance; and whether it unreasonably interferes with an employee’s work performance.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

**AFFIRMED.**