

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 15a0781n.06

Case No. 14-4022

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**

FILED
Dec 02, 2015
DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

| | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------------|
| HEATHER LOVE CARMAN, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff-Appellant, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | ON APPEAL FROM THE |
| |) | UNITED STATES DISTRICT |
| |) | COURT FOR THE NORTHERN |
| ERIE COUNTY, et al., |) | DISTRICT OF OHIO |
| |) | |
| Defendants-Appellees. |) | |

OPINION

BEFORE: BOGGS and McKEAGUE, Circuit Judges; BERTELSMAN, District Judge.*

PER CURIAM. Plaintiff Heather Love Carman applied for four different jobs with the defendants¹—two assistant prosecutor positions with the Erie County Prosecutor’s Office and two director positions with the Erie County Department of Job and Family Services. She never received an interview for any of the four jobs, nor was she offered any of the positions. Carman alleges that the defendants did not hire her because she is African American. The defendants claim that they did not hire her because (1) an assistant prosecutor who had formerly worked with Carman in private practice still held animosity toward her and threatened to quit if Carman

*The Honorable William O. Bertelsman, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky, sitting by designation.

¹ Plaintiff’s claims are against Erie County, the Erie County Board of Commissioners, the Erie County Prosecutor’s Office, and the Erie County Department of Job and Family Services.

was hired and (2) because Carman was never the better candidate (and on two occasions was unqualified for the position). The district court granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment, and Carman now appeals.

We review a district court's grant of summary judgment de novo. *Chen v. Dow Chem. Co.*, 580 F.3d 394, 400 (6th Cir. 2009). Having duly considered the district court's opinion in light of Carman's appellate arguments, we find no error. Her arguments are meritless and are fairly and adequately addressed in the district court's opinion. To issue another opinion reiterating the analysis would be duplicative and unnecessary. Accordingly, we AFFIRM the district court's order granting summary judgment.