

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-1279**

---

VINCENTA MEFFORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WILKINS BUICK, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Alexander Harvey II, Senior District Judge. (CA-98-1483-H)

---

Submitted: September 30, 1999

Decided: October 18, 1999

---

Before WILKINS, NIEMEYER, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alan H. Legum, Rebecca B. Brugger, ALAN HILLIARD LEGUM, P.A., Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellant. Nevett Steele, Jr., Carolyn C. Williamson, NEVETT STEELE, JR., P.A., Towson, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Vincenta Mefford appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in her employer's favor in this age discrimination action. We have reviewed the briefs, the joint appendix, and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. We agree with the district court that the isolated statements on which Mefford relied did not amount to "direct evidence of a stated purpose to discriminate [on the basis of age] and/or circumstantial evidence of a stated purpose to discriminate [on the basis of age] of sufficient probative force to reflect a genuine issue of material fact." EEOC v. Clay Printing Co., 955 F.2d 936, 941 (4th Cir. 1992) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court. See Mefford v. Wilkins Buick, Inc., No. CA-98-1483-H (D. Md. Feb. 5, 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