UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

————————————

No. 15-1226

————————————

ADRIENNE WALKER-PITTMAN,

> Plaintiff - Appellant,

> v.

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION; MARYLAND TRANSIT
ADMINISTRATION,

> Defendants - Appellees.

————————————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, Chief District
Judge. (1:14-cv-00202-CCB)

————————————

Submitted: November 30, 2016   Decided: December 21, 2016

————————————

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and KING and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

————————————

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

————————————

John H. Morris, Jr., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Brian
E. Frosh, Attorney General of Maryland, Jennifer L. Katz, Eric
S. Hartwig, Assistant Attorneys General, Baltimore, Maryland,
for Appellees.

————————————

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Adrienne Walker-Pittman appeals the district court's order granting the Maryland Department of Transportation's and the Maryland Transportation Administration's motion to dismiss Walker-Pittman's retaliation and race and gender discrimination claims, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 2008 & Supp. 2016); retaliation and age discrimination claims, brought pursuant to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 621 to 634 (West 2008 & Supp. 2016); retaliation and disability discrimination claims, brought pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101-12213 (2012), and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 701 to 796l (West 2008 & Supp. 2016); and unlawful employment practices claims, brought pursuant to the Maryland Fair Employment Practices Act, Md. Code Ann., State Gov't § 20-606(a)(1)(i) (West 2014). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. See Walker-Pittman v. Md. Dep't of Transp., No. 1:14-cv-00202-CCB (D. Md. Jan. 29, 2015). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

2

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

<u>AFFIRMED</u>