

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

ALMA YOUNG,
Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
AGRICULTURE, Secretary Dan
Glickman,
Defendant-Appellee.

and

No. 98-1802

JOHN DUNMORE, Deputy Director of
Division Director Economic
Research Service, USDA; SARA
MAZIE, Associate Division Director,
U.S. Department of Agriculture;
RICHARD LONG, Deputy Director to
the Associate Director, Economic
Research Service, USDA,
Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Peter J. Messitte, District Judge.
(CA-96-2818-PJM)

Submitted: March 23, 1999

Decided: April 21, 1999

Before MURNAGHAN and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges, and
BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Christina Northern, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Appellant. Lynne A. Battaglia, United States Attorney, Tarra DeShields, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Alma Young appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment for the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) in this employment discrimination action. She alleged that the USDA discriminated against her on the basis of her race in failing to promote her and in failing to provide sufficient training to qualify her for promotion. She claims a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, as amended. In addition, Young alleges First and Fourteenth Amendment violations.

We review the district court's grant of summary judgment de novo. Beard Plumbing & Heating, Inc. v. Thompson Plastics, Inc., 152 F.3d 313, 315 (4th Cir. 1998). Summary judgment is appropriate where the evidence establishes that there is no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 250 (1986).

We conclude that the district court correctly found no issues of material fact precluding entry of summary judgment for USDA. Young did not establish a prima facie case supporting her Title VII claim, either by direct proof or inference. McDonnell Douglas Corp.

v. Green, 411 U.S. 792, 802-03 (1973). We perceive no merit in her First and Fourteenth Amendment allegations. Therefore, we affirm the judgment of the district court. 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