

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1160

PRISCILLA PELZER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MEGAN J. BRENNAN, Postmaster General, United States Postal
Services, Agency. Capitol Metro Area,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

JANICE SANDERLIN; SHARON PETERS; PAULA ARMATIS,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District
Judge. (2:15-cv-00290-RAJ-LRL)

Submitted: May 26, 2016

Decided: May 31, 2016

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, and NIEMEYER and FLOYD, Circuit
Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Priscilla Pelzer, Appellant Pro Se. Joel Eric Wilson, Assistant
United States Attorney, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Priscilla Pelzer appeals the district court's judgment granting Megan J. Brennan's summary judgment motion on her race discrimination claim, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012) (Title VII).^{*} We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Pelzer v. Brennan, No. 2:15-cv-00290-RAJ-LRL (E.D. Va. Dec. 18, 2015). 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

^{*} The district court previously dismissed Pelzer's Title VII harassment claim; Title VII race discrimination claim as it pertained to the individual Defendants; state law defamation claim; and her claims brought pursuant to the Family and Medical Leave Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 to 2654 (2012), and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 701 to 7961 (West 2008 & Supp. 2013). Pelzer does not challenge the district court's dispositive holdings regarding these claims in her informal brief and, thus, she has waived appellate review of this order. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (directing the appealing party to present "specific issues and supporting facts and arguments" in an informal brief); see also Canady v. Crestar Mortg. Corp., 109 F.3d 969, 973-74 (4th Cir. 1997) (holding that issues not briefed are waived).