

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1953

SHEREEN MILLS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. James C. Fox, Senior District Judge. (5:06-cv-00097-F)

Submitted: June 19, 2008

Decided: July 3, 2008

Before KING and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

B. Ervin Brown, II, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellant. Roy Cooper, North Carolina Attorney General, Alexandra M. Hightower, Assistant Attorney General, Ebony J. Pittman, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sheree Mills appeals the district court's orders granting summary judgment to Defendant on her Title VII complaint and denying her subsequent post-judgment motion for reconsideration. On appeal, Mills argues that the court erred in denying relief on her disparate treatment claim and in finding that she failed to adequately allege a disparate impact claim.

This court reviews *de novo* a district court's order granting summary judgment. Moore Bros. v. Brown & Root, Inc., 207 F.3d 717, 722 (4th Cir. 2000). Summary judgment is appropriate only if, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986); Evans v. Technologies Applications & Serv. Co., 80 F.3d 954, 958 (4th Cir. 1996). In order to withstand a motion for summary judgment, the non-moving party must produce competent evidence sufficient to reveal the existence of a genuine issue of material fact. Greensboro Prof'l Fire Fighters Ass'n v. City of Greensboro, 64 F.3d 962, 967 (4th Cir. 1995).

We have reviewed the record, the parties' briefs, and the materials submitted in the joint appendix, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. 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