

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1657

DIANA K. LIVINGSTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY, also known as Ohmeda Medical/GE
Medical; DATEX-OHMEDA, INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. William D. Quarles, Jr., District
Judge. (1:05-cv-03401-WDQ)

Submitted: February 19, 2009

Decided: March 10, 2009

Before MICHAEL, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bart Garry, LAW OFFICE OF BART GARRY, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellant. Michael Aldana, Joseph O. Wilson, QUARLES & BRADY,
LLP, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Elena D. Marcuss, MCGUIREWOODS LLP,
Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Diana K. Livingston appeals a district court's order granting summary judgment to her employer on her retaliation claim under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This court reviews a district court's order granting summary judgment de novo, drawing reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. See Hooven-Lewis v. Caldera, 249 F.3d 259, 265 (4th Cir. 2001). Summary judgment may be granted only when "there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and [movant] is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); see Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986).

We have thoroughly reviewed the parties' briefs, the joint and supplemental appendices, and the district court's opinion, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Livingston v. Gen. Elec. Co., No. 1:05-cv-03401-WDQ (D. Md. May 7, 2008). 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