

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

United States Court of Appeals
Fifth Circuit

FILED

February 12, 2014

Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk

No. 13-30674
Summary Calendar

GLORIA WILLIAMS-KATES,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, Jeh
Johnson, Secretary,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
U.S.D.C. No. 2:12-cv-00772-SS

Before DAVIS, SOUTHWICK, and HIGGINSON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiff Gloria Williams-Kates appeals from a final judgment dismissing all of her claims, giving us jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We affirm.

Williams-Kates sued her former employer, the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”), under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, asserting claims of discrimination due to age, disability, and gender, as well as retaliation. The parties consented to the magistrate judge’s deciding the case.

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 13-30674

DHS submitted a motion for summary judgment, and Williams-Kates eventually filed two volumes of exhibits in opposition.

The magistrate granted summary judgment in favor of DHS on all of Williams-Kates's claims, dismissing her suit with prejudice on June 7, 2013. The magistrate judge's Order and Reasons carefully set out the facts at issue, noted Williams-Kates's often unsupported objections to each fact, and applied to the undisputed material facts the burden-shifting framework under *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792 (1973). On appeal, Williams-Kates essentially reurges the same arguments she raised below.

Under our *de novo* review of this grant of summary judgment, applying the same standards under Fed. R. Civ. P. 56 that the magistrate judge applied,¹ we reach the same conclusions that the magistrate judge reached, for the same reasons stated in her Order and Reasons. Accordingly, we affirm.

¹ See *Burrell v. Dr. Pepper/Seven Up Bottling Group, Inc.*, 482 F.3d 408, 411 (5th Cir. 2007) (citing *Jones v. Comm'r*, 338 F.3d 463, 466 (5th Cir. 2003)).