

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1423

CLARENCE B. ROSS, SR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CITY OF ANNAPOLIS; ALFRED A. HOPKINS, Former
Mayor,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (CA-
99-268-CCB)

Submitted: September 25, 2001

Decided: October 10, 2001

Before TRAXLER and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clarence B. Ross, Sr., Appellant Pro Se. Paul Garvey Goetzke,
COUNCIL, BARADEL, KOSMERL & NOLAN, P.A., Annapolis, Maryland;
Elissa Doe Levan, MILES & STOCKBRIDGE, Columbia, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Clarence B. Ross, Sr., appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of his former employer in this action alleging violations of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. We have reviewed the record, Ross' informal appellate brief, the district court's order, the transcript of the hearing on the motion for summary judgment, and find no reversible error. Because Ross failed to challenge on appeal the district court's reasoning relating to the denial of a promotion, he has not preserved this issue for our review. 4th Cir. R. 34(b). With regard to his claims relating to his discharge, we agree with the district court that Ross failed to show that the reason for his discharge was pretextual. We also decline to consider the claims Ross raises for the first time on appeal. 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). Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Ross v. City of Annapolis, No. CA-99-268-CCB (D. Md. filed Feb. 22, 2001; entered Feb. 23, 2001). 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