## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-2243

| LISA MARIE KERR,   |
|--|
| Plaintiff - Appellant,   |
| v.   |
| MARSHALL UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS; GENE BRETT KUHN; JUDITH SOUTHARD; SANDRA BAILEY; TERESA EAGLE; LISA HEATON; DAVID PITTENGER,   |
| Defendants - Appellees.  |
| No. 18-1195  |
| LISA MARIE KERR,   |
| Plaintiff - Appellant,   |
| $\mathbf{v}.$  |
| MARSHALL UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS; GENE BRETT KUHN; JUDITH SOUTHARD; SANDRA BAILEY; TERESA EAGLE; LISA HEATON, and; DAVID PITTENGER,  |
| Defendants - Appellees.  |
| Appeals from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia at Charleston. Thomas E. Johnston, Chief District Judge. (2:14-cv-12333; 2:16-cv-06589) |
|  |

| Subinitied: August 25, 2018   |   |
|---|---|
| Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, a  | nd TRAXLER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.            |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curiar                                    | m opinion.  |
| Lisa Marie Kerr, Appellant Pro Se. Huntington, West Virginia, for App | John Andrew Hess, STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC pellees. |
| Unpublished opinions are not bindi                                    | ng precedent in this circuit.                     |

## PER CURIAM:

Lisa Marie Kerr appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and dismissing her July 2016 complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Kerr also appeals the district court's order denying her motion to reopen the judgment in her 2014 action, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b), and for leave to amend her 2014 complaint, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). We have reviewed the records and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Kerr v. Marshall Univ. Bd. of Governors*, No. 2:16-cv-06589 (S.D.W. Va. Sept. 21, 2017); *Kerr v. Marshall Univ. Bd. of Governors*, No. 2:14-cv-12333 (S.D.W. Va. Feb. 16, 2018). We deny Defendants' motion to deem frivolous Kerr's appeal in No. 17-2243 and deny Kerr's motion for sanctions. 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**