

ON REHEARING

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1910

YURI J. STOYANOV,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHARLES BEHRLE, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of the Carderock Division; GARY M. JEBSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 70; KEVIN M. WILSON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 74; BRUCE CROCK, Individually and in his Official Capacity as the Head of Code 743; DAVID CARON, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Assistant Counsel Code 39; CATHERINE KISSMEIER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Counsel Code 40; GARTH JENSEN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Deputy Head Code 70; MARY (CATHY) FOWLER, Individually and in her Official Capacity as Administrative Officer Code 70; KENNETH FORMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 73; KENNETH GOLDMAN, Individually and in his Official Capacity as Head of Code 71; ARCHER MACY, Individually and in His Official Capacity as the Head of Naval Surface Warfare Center; SEAN J. STACKLEY, Acting Secretary of the Navy,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (1:07-cv-01985-DKC)

Submitted: February 6, 2017

Decided: March 3, 2017

Before MOTZ, TRAXLER, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yuri J. Stoyanov, Appellant Pro Se. Allen F. Loucks, Kelly Marie Marzullo, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yuri J. Stoyanov appeals the district court's orders entered after the district court dismissed Stoyanov's claims against Defendants, including claims brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012), and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §§ 621 to 634 (2012). Although we previously affirmed the district court's orders, we subsequently granted panel rehearing and denied rehearing en banc.

We have again reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Stoyanov v. Behrle, No. 1:07-cv-01985-DKC (D. Md. Aug. 26, 2015 & June 13, 2016). 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