

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1543

SANDRA HARMON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION, a/k/a Cumberland County School District North Carolina; MARIE PIERCE-FORD, individually and in her capacity as Principal of Luther Nick Jeralds', a Cumberland Co. Board of Ed. School; LARISSA PERKINS, in her capacity as Asst. Principal of Luther Nick Jeralds', a Cumberland Co. Board of Ed. School (NOMINAL); STAFFORD DANIELS, in her capacity as Asst. Principal of Luther Nick Jeralds', a Cumberland Co. Board of Ed. School (NOMINAL); DR. JAMES MCLAUCHLIN, Chair of Cumberland County Board of Education, School Board Members; DR. FRANK TILL, Superintendant Cumberland County Board of Education Schools; JOSEPH LOCKLEAR, Deceased, in his former capacity as Associate Superintendent of Cumberland County Schools (NOMINAL),

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (5:15-cv-00485-BR)

Submitted: September 29, 2016

Decided: October 14, 2016

Before WYNN, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sandra Harmon, Appellant Pro Se. James Scott Lewis, Conor Patrick Regan, HEDRICK, GARDNER, KINCHELOE & GAROFALO, LLP, Wilmington, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sandra Harmon appeals the district court's order granting Defendants' motion to dismiss her complaint brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012), and also alleging equal protection and due process violations. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Harmon v. Cumberland Cty. Bd. of Educ., No. 5:15-cv-00485-BR (E.D.N.C. May 5, 2016). We deny as moot Harmon's motion to expedite ruling. 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