

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1686

KERRY LEE WAGAMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

GORDON R. ENGLAND, Secretary of the Navy,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (8:05-cv-02258-PJM)

Submitted: May 11, 2007

Decided: June 11, 2007

Before WILLIAMS, KING, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael J. Snider, Ari Taragin, Jeffery C. Taylor, SNIDER & ASSOCIATES, LLC, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Jamie M. Bennett, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kerry Lee Wagaman appeals the district court's order that granted summary judgment in favor of his former employer in his civil action in which he alleged violations of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and the Rehabilitation Act and retaliation. For the reasons discussed below, we affirm.

Summary judgment is appropriate only if, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986). We have thoroughly reviewed the briefs and joint appendix, including the transcript of the summary judgment hearing, and find no reversible error.* Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated on the record by the district court. See Wagaman v. England, No. 8:05-cv-02258-PJM (D. Md. May 17, 2006). 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

*Wagaman also challenges the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f) motion for a continuance to conduct discovery. We find no abuse of discretion in the district court's denial of Wagaman's motion.