

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 09a0725n.06

Case No. 08-6417

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

FILED
Nov 05, 2009
LEONARD GREEN, Clerk

PATRICIA WILLIAMS,)
)
 Plaintiff-Appellant,)
)
 v.)
)
 EXPEDITORS INTERNATIONAL OF)
 WASHINGTON, INC.,)
)
 Defendant-Appellee.)
 _____)

**ON APPEAL FROM THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE WESTERN
DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY**

BEFORE: BATCHELDER, Chief Judge and GIBBONS, Circuit Judge; and MALONEY, Chief District Judge.*

ALICE M. BATCHELDER, Chief Judge. Patricia Williams sued her former employer, Expeditors International, claiming that she was denied promotions on the basis of her gender and her age, in violation of federal law.¹ Expeditors moved for summary judgment and the district court analyzed the claim pursuant to *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792, 802-04 (1973). The court found that Ms. Williams had set out a prima facie case, but that Expeditors had responded with a legitimate non-discriminatory reason — that the chosen employees were better qualified. The district court then concluded that Ms. Williams had not proven (and could not prove) any pretext sufficient to establish her claim of discrimination and overcome summary judgment.

*The Honorable Paul L. Maloney, Chief United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan, sitting by designation.

¹She also claimed that she was wrongfully denied overtime wages and appealed the district court’s grant of summary judgment to the defendants on that claim. But she has abandoned that claim on appeal by failing to offer any argument in support of her position or any legal citation that would support such an argument.

After carefully reviewing the record, the law, and the arguments on appeal, we conclude that the district court's opinion correctly sets out the applicable law and correctly applies that law to the facts in the record. The issuance of a full written opinion by this court would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court's opinion, we **AFFIRM**.