

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1682

AURA LABRO KARAGIANNOPOULOS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CITY OF LOWELL,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Frank D. Whitney, District Judge. (3:05-cv-00401-FDW-DCK)

Submitted: October 8, 2008

Decided: December 12, 2008

Before TRAXLER, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Aura LaBro Karagiannopoulos, Appellant Pro Se. Martha Raymond Thompson, STOTT, HOLLOWELL, PALMER & WINDHAM, Gastonia, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aura LaBro Karagiannopoulos appeals a district court order and judgment granting summary judgment to the City of Lowell, North Carolina, and dismissing her civil rights complaint. We note Karagiannopoulos in her informal brief failed to challenge the district court's findings with respect to the order granting summary judgment except for two meritless challenges to the court's decision to admit and review two items of evidence. As a result, she has waived any review by this court of the merits of her complaint and the district court's findings leading to the dismissal of her complaint. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999). We find Karagiannopoulos' various challenges to the court's order denying the motion for default judgment to be entirely without merit and, insofar as she claims there was a conspiracy between the district court and the City of Lowell, such claim is delusional. We find the court did not abuse its discretion by denying the motion for default judgment. Mitchell v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 294 F.3d 1309, 1316 (11th Cir. 2002); White v. Gregory, 1 F.3d 267, 270 (4th Cir. 1993). The clear policy of the federal rules is to encourage whenever possible the disposition of claims on the merits. Reizakis v. Loy, 490 F.2d 1132, 1135 (4th Cir. 1974). "[I]n situations where a party is not responsible for the fault of

his attorney, dismissal may be invoked only in extreme circumstances." Id.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order and judgment. 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