## UNPUBLISHED

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| •   |                       | •                        |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|
|   | No. 17-1605           |                          |
| ADRIENNE L. MCADORY,  |                       |                          |
| Plaintiff - App   | pellant,              |                          |
| v.  |                       |                          |
| VAIL TECHNOLOGIES,  |                       |                          |
| Defendant - A   | ppellee.              |                          |
|   |                       |                          |
| Appeal from the United States E Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, |                       | _                        |
| Submitted: August 17, 2017                                      |                       | Decided: August 21, 2017 |
| Before KEENAN, THACKER, and                                     | d HARRIS, Circuit J   | udges.                   |
| Affirmed by unpublished per curia                               | m opinion.            |                          |
| Adrienne L. McAdory, Appellan<br>Young, KUTAK ROCK, LLP, Wa     | -                     | <del>_</del>             |
| Unpublished opinions are not hind                               | ing precedent in this | circuit                  |

## PER CURIAM:

Adrienne L. McAdory appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Vail Technologies ("Vail") on McAdory's pregnancy discrimination claim. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because McAdory's informal brief does not challenge the district court's alternative holdings that she failed to establish her prima facie case or that Vail's legitimate, nondiscriminatory reason for terminating the subcontract was a pretext for discrimination, McAdory has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Brown v. Nucor Corp.*, 785 F.3d 895, 918 (4th Cir. 2015); *Williams v. Giant Food Inc.*, 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

**AFFIRMED**