Case: 10-60685 Document: 00511431606 Page: 1 Date Filed: 03/31/2011

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT United States Cou

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED March 31, 2011

No. 10-60685

Lyle W. Cayce

Clerk

VERSA BROWN,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

NORTH PANOLA SCHOOL DISTRICT;
THE EXCELLENCE GROUP, LIMITED LIABILITY CORPORATION;
BOB STREBECK, Conservator, North Panola School District,
in His Official and Individual Capacities;
LUCINDA CARTER, Former Superintendent,
North Panola School District, in Her Official and Individual Capacities,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Mississippi USDC No. 2:09-CV-102 Case: 10-60685 Document: 00511431606 Page: 2 Date Filed: 03/31/2011

No. 10-60685

Before SMITH, DeMOSS, and OWEN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Versa Brown was discharged as a high school principal and sued the school district, school officials, and a private educational-enrichment group under various state and federal theories. The district court granted the defendants summary judgment, explaining its reasoning in a thorough and convincing memorandum opinion, *Brown v. N. Panola Sch. Dist.*, No. 2:09-CV-102, 2010 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 76419 (N.D. Miss. July 28, 2010).

We have reviewed the briefs, pertinent portions of the record, and the applicable law and have heard the arguments of counsel. Because there is no error, we affirm, essentially for the reasons given by the district court.

While this matter was pending on appeal, the Supreme Court decided Staub v. Proctor Hospital, 131 S. Ct. 1186 (2011), which addresses the so-called "cat's paw" theory of employer liability regarding actions by supervisors. We have sua sponte examined Staub and find nothing in it that affects our conclusion that summary judgment was proper. We express no view on what legal standard applies to cat's paw claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 in light of Staub.

The summary judgment is AFFIRMED.

 $^{^*}$ Pursuant to 5th Cir. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5th Cir. R. 47.5.4.