

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-1695**

---

MAUREEN A. TRRAFT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

AMERICAN THRESHOLD INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (CA-97-162-1-T)

---

Submitted: October 8, 1998

Decided: October 22, 1998

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Maureen A. Traft, Appellant Pro Se. Grant Beecher Osborne, MCGUIRE, WOOD & BISSETTE, P.A., Asheville, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Maureen A. Traft appeals from the district court's order denying her motion for reconsideration filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Our review of the record discloses that this appeal is without merit. Traft's motion for reconsideration does not demonstrate that her action was improperly dismissed. We therefore find that the district court's denial of her Rule 59(e) motion was not an abuse of discretion,\* and affirm the district court's order on the reasoning of the district court. Traft v. American Threshold Indus., Inc., No. CA-97-162-1-T (W.D.N.C. Apr. 7, 1998). To the extent Traft raises issues in her informal brief not previously raised in the district court, including her attempt to raise claims relating to documents not part of the district court's record, we decline to consider such claims or documents on appeal. We deny Traft's motion to vacate this court's order allowing the Appellee leave to supplement its informal brief and deny as moot Traft's petition for order of lis pendens. 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

---

\* See United States v. Williams, 674 F.2d 310, 312 (4th Cir. 1982).