

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Fifth Circuit**

No. 01-50220
Summary Calendar

ANGELICA LINKE,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION, et al,
Defendants,
TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION;
EL PASO STATE CENTER,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 01-50308

ANGELICA LINKE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND MENTAL RETARDATION;
EL PASO STATE CENTER; MIKE TARANGO,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas, El Paso Division
(EP-99-CV-343-H)

March 20, 2002

Before DAVIS, BENAVIDES and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:¹

Plaintiff Linke brought suit against the Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation and others claiming sexual harassment and intentional infliction of emotional distress, attaching a right-to-sue letter from the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. The district court dismissed plaintiff's claims of intentional infliction of emotional distress, *quid pro quo* sexual harassment, and Title VII retaliation. The remaining claim of hostile environment sexual harassment was submitted to a jury which found in favor of Linke awarding damages of \$125,000. The defendants appeal the judgment of the district court implementing the jury verdict and the damage award. Linke appeals the district courts' dismissal of the above listed counts on summary judgment. Based on our review, the trial and summary judgment records support the action taken by the district court on both the motion for summary judgment complained of by the plaintiff and the denial of the motion for judgment as a matter of law complained of by the defendants.

As to the quantum of damages awarded to Linke by the jury, the verdict is not contrary to right reason or entirely disproportionate to the injury sustained. Linke testified that she was under a psychiatrist's care for several months and attributed the break up of her marriage to her working conditions.

Because we find no reversible error, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

AFFIRMED..

¹ 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 R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR.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.