

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED 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Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.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Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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