

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1701

PAULINE ROWL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SMITH DEBNAM NARRON WYCHE SAINTSING & MYERS, LLP; KIRSCHBAUM
NANNEY KEENAN & GRIFFIN, PA; MONOGRAM CREDIT CARD BANK OF
GEORGIA, a/k/a GE Financial Corporation, a/k/a GE Money
Bank, a/k/a General Electric Capital Corporation, a/k/a
General Electric Company, a/k/a General Electric Capital
Services, Incorporated; IBM COASTAL FEDERAL CREDIT UNION,
d/b/a Coastal Federal Credit Union, a/k/a Coastal Credit
Union Service Organization Inc, a/k/a A.S.F. Inc of Wake
County, d/b/a Coastal Federal Financial Group, LLC, a/k/a
Atlantic States Financial Inc., a/k/a Atlantic States
Financial LLC; THOMAS F. MOORE, Judge; RBS CITIZENS, N.A.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J.
Conrad, Jr., Chief District Judge. (3:07-cv-00491-RJC-DLH)

Submitted: April 5, 2010

Decided: April 29, 2010

Before KING, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Pauline Rowl, Appellant Pro Se. Caren D. Enloe, SMITH DEBNAM
NARRON WYCHE SAINTSING & MYERS, LLP, Raleigh, North Carolina;

Pamela P. Keenan, KIRSCHBAUM, NANNEY, KEENAN & GRIFFIN, PA,
Raleigh, North Carolina; Jon Berkelhammer, SMITH MOORE, LLP,
Greensboro, North Carolina; Jeffrey Phillips MacHarg, SMITH
MOORE LEATHERWOOD LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina; Grady L.
Balentine, Jr., Special Deputy Attorney General, Raleigh, North
Carolina; Willard Travis Barkley, BARKLEY LAW OFFICES, P.C.,
Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Pauline Rowl appeals the district court's orders dismissing her federal civil rights suit. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Rowl v. Smith Debnam Narron Wyche Saintsing & Myers, LLP, No. 3:07-cv-00491-RJC-DLH (W.D.N.C. Jan. 23, 2009 & June 4, 2009). 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