

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 98-30458

---

VENESSA S. PATTERSON;  
MATTHEW PATTERSON, JR.

Plaintiff-Appellants,

versus

PREMIER BANK; CLAUDE PLATTE;  
JAMES LOPEZ,

Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Middle District of Louisiana  
(95-CV-1975)

---

February 12, 1999

Before JOLLY, WIENER, and PARKER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

In this Title VII sexual harassment case, Plaintiffs-Appellants Venessa and Matthew Patterson ask us to reverse the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Defendant-Appellant Premier Bank,<sup>1</sup> dismissing the Pattersons' action. They insist that the district court erred in concluding that (1) the

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

<sup>1</sup> Defendants Platte and Lopez are now deceased and have been dismissed as defendants pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. 25(a).

conduct complained of was neither severe nor pervasive and thus was not actionable under Title VII, (2) the actions taken by Premier to deter recurrence of such inappropriate behavior after Mrs. Patterson complained were prompt and adequate, and (3) the inappropriate conduct of Lopez, a non-supervisory fellow employee, was not sufficiently egregious to be actionable under Louisiana law, either as a violation of state anti-discrimination law or as the intentional infliction of emotional distress. Our de novo review of the record on appeal in light of the applicable law and the arguments of counsel advanced in their respective appellate briefs and their oral presentations to this court, satisfies us that summary judgment was properly granted for the reasons set forth by the district court.

AFFIRMED.