



---

2009 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

1-13-2009

# Claude Clark v. SEPTA

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Non-Precedential

Docket No. 08-1531

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2009](http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2009)

---

## Recommended Citation

"Claude Clark v. SEPTA" (2009). *2009 Decisions*. 2044.

[http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2009/2044](http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2009/2044)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2009 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact [Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu](mailto:Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu).

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 08-1531

---

CLAUDE J. CLARK,

Appellant

v.

SOUTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(D.C. No. 06-cv-04497)  
District Judge: Honorable Paul S. Diamond

---

Submitted December 8, 2008

Before: MCKEE, SMITH and ROTH, Circuit Judges.

(Filed: January 13, 2009)

---

OPINION

---

MCKEE, Circuit Judge.

Claude Clark appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Agency ("SEPTA") and against him on the

claim he brought under the Americans with Disability Act, the Rehabilitation Act and Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

Since we write primarily for the parties who are familiar with the background of this case, we need not repeat the factual or procedural history. We have reviewed Judge Diamond's thoughtful and careful Memorandum, dated January 24, 2008, in which the district court explains why defendant is entitled to summary judgment and why plaintiff is not. We can add little to the district court's analysis and will therefore affirm substantially for the reasons set forth in that Memorandum.