

UNPUBLISHED

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

NANCY HOOD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LOCKHEED MARTIN CORPORATION;
LOCKHEED MARTIN FEDERAL SYSTEMS
INCORPORATED,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 00-1683

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.

T. S. Ellis, III, District Judge.

(CA-99-1525-A)

Submitted: November 9, 2000

Decided: November 30, 2000

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Nancy Hood, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Mark Dare, REED, SMITH,
HAZEL & THOMAS, L.L.P., Falls Church, Virginia; Paul Gregory
Joyce, REED, SMITH, HAZEL & THOMAS, L.L.P., Alexandria,
Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Nancy Hood appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action alleging inter alia employment discrimination in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12101-12213 (West 1995 & Supp. 2000). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Hood failed to establish a prima facie case of discrimination on the basis of her alleged disability. *See Halperin v. Abacus Tech. Corp.*, 128 F.3d 191, 197 (4th Cir. 1997); *see also Baird v. Rose*, 192 F.3d 462, 469-70 (4th Cir. 1999) (refining causation element for ADA plaintiff). Hood also failed to establish a causal connection between her protected activities and her termination that would support a finding of illegal retaliation. *See Williams v. Cerberonics, Inc.*, 871 F.2d 452, 457 (4th Cir. 1989). Finally, Hood's allegations fall far short of stating a claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress. *See Russo v. White*, 400 S.E.2d 160, 162 (Va. 1991). Finding no error, we affirm the order of the district court. The pending motion to vacate this court's order granting an extension of time in which to file a reply brief is denied as moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

UNPUBLISHED

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

NANCY HOOD,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LOCKHEED MARTIN CORPORATION;
LOCKHEED MARTIN FEDERAL SYSTEMS
INCORPORATED,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 00-1683

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.
T. S. Ellis, III, District Judge.
(CA-99-1525-A)

Submitted: November 9, 2000

Decided: November 30, 2000

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Nancy Hood, Appellant Pro Se. Richard Mark Dare, REED, SMITH,
HAZEL & THOMAS, L.L.P., Falls Church, Virginia; Paul Gregory
Joyce, REED, SMITH, HAZEL & THOMAS, L.L.P., Alexandria,
Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Nancy Hood appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action alleging inter alia employment discrimination in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 12101-12213 (West 1995 & Supp. 2000). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Hood failed to establish a prima facie case of discrimination on the basis of her alleged disability. *See Halperin v. Abacus Tech. Corp.*, 128 F.3d 191, 197 (4th Cir. 1997); *see also Baird v. Rose*, 192 F.3d 462, 469-70 (4th Cir. 1999) (refining causation element for ADA plaintiff). Hood also failed to establish a causal connection between her protected activities and her termination that would support a finding of illegal retaliation. *See Williams v. Cerberonics, Inc.*, 871 F.2d 452, 457 (4th Cir. 1989). Finally, Hood's allegations fall far short of stating a claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress. *See Russo v. White*, 400 S.E.2d 160, 162 (Va. 1991). Finding no error, we affirm the order of the district court. The pending motion to vacate this court's order granting an extension of time in which to file a reply brief is denied as moot. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED