

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1394

GAIL EVANS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILLIAMSBURG TECHNICAL COLLEGE; CLIFTON
ELLIOTT, a/k/a Rusty Elliott, individually and
in his official capacity as agent and Dean of
Instruction of Williamsburg Technical College;
RONALD HAMPTON, in his official position as
acting President of Williamsburg Technical
College,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. Terry L. Wooten, District Judge.
(4:03-cv-03939-TLW)

Submitted: January 10, 2008

Decided: January 25, 2008

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James L. Bell, THE BELL LAW FIRM, P.A., Charleston, South Carolina,
for Appellant. Charles J. Boykin, Karla McLawhorn Hawkins, BOYKIN,
DAVIS & HAWKINS, L.L.C., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gail Evans appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and granting summary judgment in favor of her former employer on her claims of discrimination, retaliation, and hostile work environment brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2000), her claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2000), and her state law claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress. This court reviews a district court's grant of summary judgment de novo. Higgins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment may only be granted when "there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and . . . the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). With this standard in mind, we have reviewed the materials before us on appeal and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Evans v. Williamsburg Tech. Coll., No. 4:03-cv-03939-TLW (D.S.C. Mar. 29, 2007). 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