

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1608

MARLENE J. ROBERTSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PRINCE WILLIAM HOSPITAL,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

PRINCE WILLIAM MEDICAL CENTER,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:11-cv-00820-GBL-JFA)

Submitted: September 26, 2012

Decided: November 2, 2012

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Marlene J. Robertson, Appellant Pro Se. Michael E. Olszewski, Paul Thomas Walkinshaw, HANCOCK, DANIEL, JOHNSON & NAGLE, PC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Marlene J. Robertson appeals the district court's orders denying her motion to amend her complaint and dismissing in part and granting summary judgment in part on her complaint alleging a 28 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) claim, a human trafficking claim, and related Virginia tort claims. On appeal, Robertson argues that the district court improperly denied leave to amend following a hearing on Appellee's motion to dismiss or for summary judgment. Because the proposed amendment would be futile, we conclude that the district court did not commit reversible error in denying leave to amend under the circumstances presented here. See Katyle v. Penn Nat'l Gaming, Inc., 637 F.3d 462, 471 (4th Cir. 2011), cert. denied, 132 S. Ct. 115 (2011); Sound of Music Co. v. Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co., 477 F.3d 910, 923-24 (7th Cir. 2007); Laber v. Harvey, 438 F.3d 404, 426-28 (4th Cir. 2006) (en banc) (providing standard of review and factors to consider in denying leave to amend).

Robertson also challenges the district court's disposition of her claims. We have reviewed the record with regard to these claims and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Robertson v. Prince William Hosp., No. 1:11-cv-00820-GBL-JFA (E.D. Va. Apr. 25, 2012). 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