

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-1900**

---

ALEKSANDR J. STOYANOV,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DONALD C. WINTER, Secretary of the Navy; STEPHAN W. PETRI, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of the Carderock Division; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; GERALD SMITH, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Deputy Head of Code 70 Carderock Division; M. KATHLEEN FOWLER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Administrative Officer Code 709; KEVIN M. WILSON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74; JAMES H. KING, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74 Carderock Division; JOHN C. DAVIES, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Deputy Head of Code 74; STEPHAN M. FARLEY, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 741; ROGER P. FORD, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 7014 Carderock Division; DAVID CARON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (1:06-cv-01245-AMD)

---

Submitted: December 15, 2009

Decided: December 17, 2009

---

Before MICHAEL and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Aleksandr J. Stoyanov, Appellant Pro Se. John Walter Sippel, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Aleksandr J. Stoyanov appeals the district court's order dismissing his claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2006), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 to 634 (2006), the Whistleblower Protection Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 1214, 1221 and 2302 (2006), and various state law tort claims, as well as its order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. See Stoyanov v. Winter, No. 1:06-cv-01245-AMD (D. Md. July 6, 2009; July 14, 2009). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED