

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 17-1321**

---

PATRICIA MITCHELL MARZETT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHARLESTON COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT; JAMES WINBUSH,  
individually and in his official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MELVIN MIDDLETON, individually and in his official capacity,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Charleston. Richard M. Gergel, District Judge. (2:14-cv-03932-RMG)

---

Submitted: August 28, 2017

Decided: September 8, 2017

---

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Patricia Mitchell Marzett, Appellant Pro Se. Elizabeth J. Palmer, ROSEN, ROSEN & HAGOOD, LLC, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Patricia Mitchell Marzett appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and granting the Defendants' motion for summary judgment in her employment discrimination action. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Marzett v. Charleston Cty. Sch. Dist.*, No. 2:14-cv-03932-RMG (D.S.C. Feb. 14, 2017).<sup>\*</sup> 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*

---

<sup>\*</sup> To the extent Marzett argues that the Defendants denied her due process by declining her request for a hearing, because this claim was not raised in her complaint, it is not properly before us. *See Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc.*, 562 F.3d 599, 617 (4th Cir. 2009) (“[A] plaintiff may not raise new claims after discovery has begun without amending [her] complaint.”). In addition, we reject Marzett's claim that the district court erred in not granting her additional discovery, because she failed to explain how the requested discovery would create a genuine issue of material fact and how she was prevented from obtaining it during the discovery window set by the magistrate judge. *See Pisano v. Strach*, 743 F.3d 927, 931 (4th Cir. 2014).