

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-1052

SHEILA VENABLE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

PENNY PRITZKER, Secretary of the US Department of Commerce,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. George L. Russell, III, District Judge. (8:13-cv-01867-GLR)

Submitted: June 30, 2015

Decided: July 30, 2015

Before NIEMEYER and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed in part, affirmed as modified in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sheila Venable, Appellant Pro Se. Jakarra Jenise Jones, Assistant United States Attorney, Molissa Heather Farber, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Sheila Venable appeals the district court's orders denying her motion to strike; granting summary judgment to her former employer, the U.S. Bureau of the Census ("the Bureau"),¹ on her claims under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII")² and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA");³ and denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motions for reconsideration.⁴ We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error.

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders denying Venable's motion to strike and her Rule 59(e) motions for reconsideration for the reasons stated by the district court. Venable v. Pritzker, No. 8:13-cv-01867-GLR (D. Md. May 30, 2014; Oct. 7, 2014; Oct. 24, 2014; Nov. 18, 2014). We also affirm the district court's grant of summary judgment to the Bureau on all Venable's ADEA claims and her Title VII claims of race

¹ Penny Pritzker was named as the defendant in her capacity as the Secretary for the U.S. Department of Commerce, under which the Bureau is situated. See 13 U.S.C. § 2 (2012); 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-16(c) (2012).

² 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012), amended by Pub. L. No. 113-235, 128 Stat. 2130, 2537 (2014).

³ 29 U.S.C. §§ 621-634 (2012).

⁴ To the extent Venable challenges the district court's denying, on the ground of mootness, her motion for leave to file her amended complaint, we conclude her challenge lacks merit.

discrimination and retaliation with respect to her January 2011 nonselection. Id.; see Kloeckner v. Solis, 133 S. Ct. 596, 601 (2012). However, we modify the court's disposition with respect to all other claims raised in Venable's complaint to reflect that they are dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. See Hentosh v. Old Dominion Univ., 767 F.3d 413, 416-17 (4th Cir. 2014).

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED IN PART AND
AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED IN PART