UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1700

MARIELA VALDERRAMA,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HONEYWELL TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Benson Everett Legg, Chief District Judge. (1:05-cv-00747-BEL)

Submitted: February 21, 2008 Decided: February 25, 2008

Before MOTZ and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mariela Valderrama, Appellant Pro Se. Rafael E. Morell, OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, PC, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mariela Valderrama appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of her former employer on her employment discrimination action brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2000) and state law. Valderrama also appeals the district court's orders denying her plea for leave to renew or to reopen motion for summary judgment and her motion to reconsider the motion to file a sur-reply, in which she sought reconsideration of the court's order granting summary judgment. This court reviews a district court's grant of summary judgment de novo. Higgins v. E.I. Dupont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment may only be granted when "there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). With this standard in mind, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Valderrama v. Honeywell Tech. Solutions, Inc., No. 1:05-cv-00747-BEL (D. Md. filed Feb. 14, 2007 & entered Feb. 15, 2007; Apr. 5, 2007 & entered Apr. 6, 2007). We deny Valderrama's pending motion for mandamus relief. 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