

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1876**

---

RONNIE CLARKE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

STEVEN ASHBY, (Former RBHA Executive Director); JOHN LINDSTROM, (Acting/Interim RBHA Executive Director); GALE PRICE, (Acting/Interim RBHA Human Resources Director); MICHAEL JOSEPH, (Current Director of RBHA's Financial/Administrative Division); JOHNNY BEATON, (Current Director of RBHA's IT/MIS Department); SAPHIRA BAKER; WAYNE BLANKS; LINDA K. CARR, Secretary\*; TRACY L. CAUSEY; FRANCES M. CHRISTIAN, Ph. D., Vice Chairperson; MARGARET N. CROWE, Chairperson; ANDREW C. EPPS, III; MARILYN T. ERICKSON, Ph. D.; SANDRA FOWLER-JONES; DELORES MCQUINN; MARTHA MUGUIRA, Ed.D.; NAPLEON L. PEOPLES; ROSE STITH-SINGLETON, M.Ed; RICHMOND BEHAVIORAL HEALTH AUTHORITY,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

H. GRAY WYATT, Treasurer; EUGENE MASON; BLAIR LARCEN; MICHAEL PARKER, (Former RBHA Human Resources Director); LISA M. HARRISON, CPA, Mtax,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, Senior District Judge. (3:07-cv-00574-REP)

---

Submitted: December 11, 2008

Decided: December 15, 2008

---

Before NIEMEYER, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ronnie Clarke, Appellant Pro Se. Lisa H. Leiner, HARMAN,  
CLAYTOR, CORRIGAN & WELLMAN, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Clarke appeals the district court's order dismissing his claims against Defendants alleging violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2000), and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1981, 1983 (2000), as well as several other federal and state law claims. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Clarke's application to proceed in forma pauperis, deny his self-styled "motion to grant summary judgment," and affirm the district court's order. See Clarke v. Ashby, No. 3:07-cv-00574-REP (E.D. Va. July 8, 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