

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-1636

JACKIE JIMOH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHARLOTTE MECKLENBURG HOUSING PARTNERSHIP, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad,
Jr., Chief District Judge. (3:08-cv-00495-RJC-DCK)

Submitted: April 27, 2011

Decided: May 13, 2011

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Angela Gray, GRAY NEWELL, LLP, Greensboro, North Carolina, for
Appellant. Charles E. Johnson, Allyson Pierce Lawless,
ROBINSON, BRADSHAW & HINSON, P.A., Charlotte, North Carolina,
for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jackie Jimoh appeals the district court's order granting the Charlotte Mecklenburg Housing Partnership, Incorporated's motion for summary judgment on Jimoh's claims of discrimination on the basis of age, race and sex, and retaliation, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 2003 & Supp. 2010), the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 621-34 (West 2006 & Supp. 2010), and 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (2006).^{*} We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated in the district court's order and judgment. Jimoh v. Charlotte Mecklenburg Hous. P'Ship, Inc., No. 3:08-cv-00495-RJC-DCK (W.D.N.C. May 12, 2010). 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

^{*} Jimoh has failed to brief, and has therefore abandoned, her state-law claims for intentional and negligent infliction of emotional distress, negligent supervision and retention of an employee, and breach of contract. See Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 607 (4th Cir. 2009), cert. denied, 130 S. Ct. 1140 (2010).