



2003 Decisions

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

1-21-2003

Lightfoot v. NJ Dept Corr

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Non-Precedential

Docket 02-1570

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2003

Recommended Citation

"Lightfoot v. NJ Dept Corr" (2003). *2003 Decisions*. 873.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2003/873

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 2003 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.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

NO. 02-1570

PETER C. LIGHTFOOT,
Appellant

v

NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTION;
JUDY DAVIS; PAUL J. REED; ERNEST MARTIN

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey
D.C. Civil No. 00-CV-04120
District Court: Hon. Stephen M. Orlofsky

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
November 4, 2002
Before: Becker, Chief Judge, McKee & Hill, * Circuit Judges,
(Filed January 21, 2003)

OPINION OF THE COURT

McKee, Circuit Judge:

Peter C. Lightfoot is an evangelical Christian who was employed as a provisional Institutional Trade Instructor at the South Woods State Prison. This case arises from his termination from his allegation that his termination was motivated by religious discrimination and retaliation for protected conduct in violation of his constitutional rights and rights secured under Title VII and the New Jersey Law Against Discrimination (“NJLAD”). He appeals from the grant of summary judgment to the defendants on his First

* Honorable James C. Hill, Eleventh Circuit, sitting by designation.

Amendment free speech and retaliation claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and his religious discrimination and retaliation claims under Title VII and NJLAD. Our review of the district court's grant of summary judgment is plenary. *Huang v. BP Amoco Corp.*, 271 F.3d 560, 564 (3d Cir. 2001).

Inasmuch as the district court (Orlofsky, J.) has already set forth the factual and procedural history of the case, we need not repeat that history here. *See Peter C. Lightfoot v. State of New Jersey Department of Corr., et al.*, No. 00-4120 (D. N.J. 2002). The district court, in its Memorandum Opinion and Order, has carefully and completely explained its reasons for denying Lightfoot the relief he seeks and granting summary judgment to the defendants. We need not engage in a redundant analysis simply to reach the same result.

Accordingly, we will affirm substantially for the reasons set forth in the district court's Memorandum Opinion.

TO THE CLERK:

Please file the foregoing opinion.

/s/ Theodore A. McKee

Circuit Judge

DATED: January 21, 2003