

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION

To be cited only in accordance with
Fed. R. App. P. 32.1

United States Court of Appeals

**For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted May 9, 2012*
Decided May 10, 2012

Before

JOEL M. FLAUM, *Circuit Judge*

ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

No. 11-3749

LORRAINE C. EAST,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LAPORTE COUNTY SHERIFF'S
DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of Indiana,
Hammond Division.

No. 2:10-cv-172

Andrew P. Rodovich,
Magistrate Judge.

ORDER

Lorraine East, a former county jail guard, sued her employer and various county officials under Title VII and the Americans with Disabilities Act, claiming that she was fired because she is black and disabled. A magistrate judge, presiding by consent, ruled after a bench trial in favor of the defendants, finding that East failed to show either that she could perform the essential functions of her job (as required for relief under the ADA) or that race

* After examining the briefs and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the briefs and the record. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

was the reason for her termination.

On appeal East's arguments boil down to an attack on the district court's resolution of conflicting evidence and credibility determinations, which this court reviews only for clear error. *See Anderson v. City of Bessemer City*, 470 U.S. 564, 573 (1985); *RK Co. v. See*, 622 F.3d 846, 852 (7th Cir. 2010). There is no clear error here. The judge sufficiently justified his decision and addressed the arguments East now raises. To the extent that East also charges the judge with bias against her, nothing in the record suggests that he exhibited the "high degree of favoritism or antagonism" that would make "fair judgment impossible." *See Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994).

AFFIRMED.