

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 00-1251

---

MARY DEW,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NABISCO, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CA-99-353-3)

---

Submitted: August 15, 2000

Decided: August 30, 2000

---

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Lisa K. Lawrence, D. Scott Gordon, LAWRENCE & ASSOCIATES, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellant. James V. Meath, Curtis M. Hairston, Jr., King F. Tower, WILLIAMS, MULLEN, CLARK & DOBBINS, P.C., Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mary Dew appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment to her employer, Nabisco, Incorporated ("Nabisco"). Dew filed a complaint against Nabisco alleging that she was the victim of disparate treatment and a hostile work environment because of her gender. The district court dismissed both claims. In her appellate brief, Dew has failed to challenge the district court's dismissal of her disparate treatment claim. Thus, it is abandoned. See Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999). We have reviewed the district court's order and opinion from the bench as to the hostile work environment claim and find no reversible error. Thus, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Dew v. Nabisco, Inc., No. CA-99-353-3 (E.D. Va. Feb. 8, 2000); see also Harris v. Forklift Sys., Inc. 510 U.S. 17, 21 (1993); Hartsell v. Duplex Prods., Inc., 123 F.3d 766, 772 (4th Cir. 1997). 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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED