

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-2485**

---

ANDREA C. WEATHERS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

THOMAS J. ZIKO; GREGORY CONNOR; HERBERT B. PETERSON;  
JONATHAN KOTCH; BARBARA K. RIMER; SANDRA L. MARTIN; THE  
UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle  
District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. Thomas D. Schroeder,  
District Judge. (1:14-cv-00828-TDS-JEP)

---

Submitted: April 29, 2016

Decided: May 16, 2016

---

Before MOTZ, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Andrea C. Weathers, Appellant Pro Se. Matthew Thomas Tulchin,  
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina;  
Gary S. Parsons, Craig Daniel Schauer, BROOKS, PIERCE, MCLENDON,  
HUMPHREY & LEONARD, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Andrea C. Weathers appeals the district court's order dismissing her federal claims with prejudice and her state law claims without prejudice and its order denying her Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter and amend its judgment. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. See Alvarado v. Bd. of Tr. of Montgomery Cmty. Coll., 928 F.2d 118, 121 (4th Cir. 1991) (requiring plaintiff alleging discrimination based on failure to promote to demonstrate that she applied for promotion and was qualified for promotion); Square Constr. Co. v. Washington Metro. Area Transp. Auth., 657 F.2d 68, 71 (4th Cir. 1981) (requiring party to "demonstrate the existence of a meritorious claim or defense" to obtain relief through Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(3)); see also Pueschel v. United States, 369 F.3d 345, 355-56 (4th Cir. 2003) ("[T]he doctrine of res judicata not only bars claims that were actually litigated in a prior proceeding, but also claims that could have been litigated."). 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