

This case was not selected for publication in the Federal Reporter.

RULINGS BY SUMMARY ORDER DO NOT HAVE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT. CITATION TO SUMMARY ORDERS FILED AFTER JANUARY 1, 2007, IS PERMITTED AND IS GOVERNED BY THIS COURT'S LOCAL RULE 0.23 AND FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 32.1. IN A BRIEF OR OTHER PAPER IN WHICH A LITIGANT CITES A SUMMARY ORDER, IN EACH PARAGRAPH IN WHICH A CITATION APPEARS, AT LEAST ONE CITATION MUST EITHER BE TO THE FEDERAL APPENDIX OR BE ACCOMPANIED BY THE NOTATION: "(SUMMARY ORDER)", UNLESS THE SUMMARY ORDER IS AVAILABLE IN AN ELECTRONIC DATABASE WHICH IS PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE WITHOUT PAYMENT OF FEE (SUCH AS THE DATABASE AVAILABLE AT [HTTP://WWW.CA2.USCOURTS.GOV](http://WWW.CA2.USCOURTS.GOV)), THE PARTY CITING THE SUMMARY ORDER MUST FILE AND SERVE A COPY OF THAT SUMMARY ORDER TOGETHER WITH THE PAPER IN WHICH THE SUMMARY ORDER IS CITED. IF NO COPY IS SERVED BY REASON OF THE AVAILABILITY OF THE ORDER ON SUCH A DATABASE, THE CITATION MUST INCLUDE REFERENCE TO THAT DATABASE AND THE DOCKET NUMBER OF THE CASE IN WHICH THE ORDER WAS ENTERED.

Please use FIND to look at the applicable circuit court rule before citing this opinion. Second Circuit Rules § 0.23. (FIND CTA2 s 0.23.)

United States Court of Appeals,
Second Circuit.

Lynette C. THOMPSON, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

**NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY,
Jack S. Lusk, Robert Reiser, Anthony Spicola
and Lisa Peragino Mintz, Defendants-Appellees.
No. 02-9247.**

Sept. 10, 2003.

Appeal from a judgment by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York (David G. Trager, Judge).

UPON CONSIDERATION WHEREOF, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that the judgment of the District Court be and it hereby is AFFIRMED.

K.C. Okoli, New York, N.Y., for Appellant.

Luisa K. Hagemeyer, (Dorothea W. Regal, on the brief), Hoguet, Newman & Regal, New York, N.Y., for Appellee.

PRESENT: McLAUGHLIN, CABRANES and B.D. PARKER, Circuit Judges.

SUMMARY ORDER

Plaintiff-Appellant Lynette Thompson, a black woman of Trinidadian origin, filed a complaint against several New York City Transit Authority employees on April 18, 1996. The complaint alleges that the defendants unlawfully discriminated against Thompson on the basis her race, gender, and national origin in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e *et seq.*, 42 U.S.C. § 1981, and New York State Executive Law § 296. In particular, the complaint asserts that the defendants discriminated against Thompson by failing to interview her for an open position in the department, failing to promote her to that position, and retaliating against her for filing an employment discrimination claim with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

On October 5, 2001, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. In a careful and comprehensive, 79-page opinion, the District Court analyzed the evidence presented by Thompson in support of each of her claims and concluded that no genuine issues of material fact existed. The District Court therefore granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment.

For substantially the reasons stated by the District Court, we agree that the defendants are entitled to summary judgment. Accordingly, the judgment of the District Court granting the defendants' motion and dismissing Thompson's complaint is hereby AFFIRMED.

.Lynette C. THOMPSON, Plaintiff-Appellant, v. NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY, Jack S. Lusk, Robert Reiser, Anthony Spicola and Lisa Peragino Mintz, Defendants-Appellees., 2003 WL

74 Fed.Appx. 143
(Cite as: 74 Fed.Appx. 143)

Page 11

23475312 (Appellate Brief) (C.A.2 April 3, 2003),
Brief of Plaintiff-Appellant

23475702 (Appellate Brief) (C.A.2 May 2, 2003),
Brief for Defendants-Appellees

.Lynette C. THOMPSON, Plaintiff-Appellant, v.
NEW YORK CITY TRANSIT AUTHORITY, Jack
S. Lusk, Robert Reiser, Anthony Spicola and Lisa
Peragino Mintz, Defendants-Appellees., 2003 WL

74 Fed.Appx. 143

END OF DOCUMENT