

**UNPUBLISHED**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1523**

---

SUSAN J. BEARNS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES E. POTTER, Postmaster General, United States Postal Service,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, District Judge. (8:06-cv-03085-DKC)

---

Submitted: January 8, 2010

Decided: February 9, 2010

---

Before MOTZ and DAVIS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sheldon L. Gnatt, KNIGHT, MANZI, NUSSBAUM & LAPLACA, P.A., Upper Marlboro, Maryland, for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Michael P. Grady, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Susan J. Bearns appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to the Defendant in Bearns's civil action. On appeal, Bearns contends the district court erred in granting summary judgment to the Defendant on her retaliation and hostile work environment claims. We affirm.

We review a district court's grant of summary judgment de novo. Jennings v. U.N.C., 482 F.3d 686, 694 (4th Cir. 2007) (en banc). "At the summary judgment stage, facts must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party only if there is a 'genuine' dispute as to those facts." Scott v. Harris, 550 U.S. 372, 380 (2007) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c)). Summary judgment "should be rendered if the pleadings, the discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). "[T]here is no issue for trial unless there is sufficient evidence favoring the nonmoving party for a jury to return a verdict for that party." Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 249-50 (1986).

With these standards in mind, we have reviewed the parties' briefs and the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Bearns v. Potter, No. 8:06-cv-03085-DKC (D. Md.

Mar. 6, 2008). 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