

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1472

RICKEY L. HAMILTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WESTINGHOUSE SAVANNAH RIVER COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Aiken. Charles E. Simons, Jr., Senior District Judge. (CA-97-2274-1-06BC)

Submitted: January 31, 2000

Decided: February 8, 2000

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Richard E. Miley, North Augusta, South Carolina, for Appellant.
Gardner G. Courson, Laura H. Huggett, Vincent J. Miraglia, MCGUIRE,
WOODS, BATTLE & BOOTHE, L.L.P., Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Rickey L. Hamilton appeals the district court's order granting Westinghouse Savannah River Company's motion for summary judgment in Hamilton's action filed under the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), and a subsequent order denying his motion to alter or amend judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). On appeal, Hamilton claims that the district court erred in concluding that he failed to satisfy the exhaustion requirement by not including his allegations of discriminatory termination in his charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, that even assuming Hamilton satisfied the exhaustion requirement, he failed to show he was "disabled" within the meaning of the ADA, and that he failed to sustain viable failure to accommodate and retaliation claims.

We have reviewed the briefs, the materials submitted in the joint appendix, and the district court's thorough opinion and order, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Hamilton v. Westinghouse Savannah River Co., No. CA-97-2274-1-06BC (D.S.C. Mar. 9 & July 19, 1999). (J.A. at 38-55, 89). 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