

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-2476

MIGUEL ANGEL ARIAS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BELL ATLANTIC NETWORK SERVICES, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

BELL ATLANTIC CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Joseph H. Young, Senior District Judge. (CA-98-2191-Y)

Submitted: July 27, 2000

Decided: August 31, 2000

Before WILKINS, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George Hermina, John Hermina, HERMINA LAW GROUP, Laurel, Maryland, for Appellant. R. Michael Smith, SHAWE & ROSENTHAL, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Miguel Arias appeals the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of his former employer in this employment discrimination action and denying his motion to compel discovery. We have reviewed the parties' briefs, the joint appendices, and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court.* See Arias v. Bell Atl. Network Servs., Inc. (D. Md. Aug. 2 & Oct. 7, 1999). 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

* We note that because Arias does not challenge the district court's finding that some of his claims were time-barred, he therefore has abandoned those claims on appeal. See Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (noting that issues not briefed or argued on appeal are deemed abandoned). We also decline to consider for the first time on appeal Arias' claims of retaliation related to his December 1996 charge of discrimination. See First Va. Banks, Inc. v. BP Exploration & Oil Inc., 206 F.3d 404, 407 n.1 (4th Cir. 2000) (declining to consider issues raised for first time on appeal); Muth v. United States, 1 F.3d 246, 250 (4th Cir. 1993) (holding that issues raised for first time on appeal generally will not be considered absent exceptional circumstances of plain error or fundamental miscarriage of justice).