

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-60137
Summary Calendar

WALTERINE H. MADDOX,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

BILOXI PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT; OLON RAY, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees; TOM BURNHAM, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees; VIRGIL STRICKLAND, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees; JUDE McDONNELL, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees; LARRY A. DRAWDY, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees; PATTI GOLDEN, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees; LUCY DENTON, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Agents of the Board of Trustees of the Biloxi Public School District; JIMMY ROY, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Members of the Board of Trustees of the Biloxi Public School District; JOHN TAPPER, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Members of the Board of Trustees of the Biloxi Public School District; RONNIE BOGARD, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Members of the Board of Trustees of the Biloxi Public School District; RUFUS SMITH, Individually and In Their Official Capacity as Members of the Board of Trustees of the Biloxi Public School District,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Southern District of Mississippi
(1:94-CV-545-R-R)

August 30, 1996

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, DUHÉ and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Walterine H. Maddox appeals the adverse summary judgment in her action involving employment discrimination and other claims. Our review of the record and briefs discloses neither error of fact nor law; accordingly, on the facts as found and authorities cited and analysis by the district court in its Memorandum Order signed on January 31, 1996 and entered February 1, 1996, the judgment appealed is AFFIRMED.

* Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.