

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1528

LINDA A. EVANS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PITT COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES; GEORGE L. PERRY,
Director of Pitt County Social Services in his official
capacity; APRIL HANNING, in her individual capacity;
CYNTHIA M. ROSS, in her individual capacity; LINDA MARTIN
CURTIS, in her individual capacity; LINDA MILLION, in her
individual capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Greenville. Louise W. Flanagan,
District Judge. (4:12-cv-00226-FL)

Submitted: September 29, 2015 Decided: October 2, 2015

Before WILKINSON and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Linda A. Evans, Appellant Pro Se. Scott Christopher Hart,
SUMRELL, SUGG, CARMICHAEL, HICKS & HART, PA, New Bern, North
Carolina, for Appellees. Linda Martin Curtis, Appellee Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Linda A. Evans filed a complaint against the Pitt County Department of Social Services ("DSS"), George Perry, April Hanning, Cynthia Ross, Linda Million, and Linda Curtis alleging claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) and under state law. The district court accepted the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissed all of Evans' claims against DSS, Perry, Ross, and Million except her claims of procedural due process violations.* The court later granted summary judgment in favor of Curtis on Evans' remaining claims. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, although we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we affirm the district court's orders. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

* On Perry, Ross, and Million's previous appeal of the district court's interlocutory order denying them absolute immunity from Evans' claims of procedural due process violations, we vacated the portion of the district court's order allowing those claims to go forward and remanded with instructions to dismiss those claims. Those issues are therefore not before this court in the current appeal.