

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1405

HENRY PENN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COUNTY OF FAIRFAX,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:06-cv-01449-CMH-TCB)

Submitted: August 14, 2008

Decided: August 19, 2008

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Henry Penn, Appellant Pro Se. James Edward Wilcox, Jr., Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Henry Penn appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of his former employer on his claims brought under the American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12213 (2000), and the Family and Medical Leave Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601-2654 (2000). We review de novo a district court's order granting summary judgment and view the facts in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. Bacon v. City of Richmond, 475 F.3d 633, 637 (4th Cir. 2007). Summary judgment is appropriate when no genuine issue of material fact exists and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). Summary judgment will be granted unless a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party on the evidence presented. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986).

With these standards in mind, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Penn v. County of Fairfax, No. 1:06-cv-01449-CMH-TCB (E.D. Va. filed Feb. 1, 2008 & entered Feb. 5, 2008). 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