

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1827

BRENDA ROBERTS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GENESIS HEALTHCARE CORPORATION,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District Judge. (1:06-cv-02305-WDQ)

Submitted: May 14, 2008

Decided: June 10, 2008

Before MICHAEL, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clarence Connelly, Jr., Washington, D.C., for Appellant. J. Michael McGuire, Darryl G. McCallum, SHAWE & ROSENTHAL, LLP, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Brenda Roberts appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Genesis Healthcare Corporation ("Genesis"), and dismissing her employment discrimination claims, filed pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e - 2000e-17 (2000), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621-634 (2000).^{*} Roberts alleged that, in terminating her employment, Genesis discriminated against her on the basis of her race (African-American) and her age. Roberts also appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment on Roberts' claim for compensation for her accrued, unused vacation time, filed pursuant to Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. § 3-505 (LexisNexis 1999).

We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Roberts v. Genesis Healthcare Corp., No. 1:06-cv-02305-WDQ (D. Md. Apr. 23, 2007). We dispense with oral argument because the

^{*}Although Roberts requested that the district court reconsider its decision by filing a timely motion pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e), her appellate brief does not challenge the court's denial of that motion. Accordingly, we have not considered on appeal any issue relating to the denial of Roberts' Rule 59(e) motion. See Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999).

facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED