

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-2318

MICHAEL SHELTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LOCKHEED MARTIN OPERATIONS SUPPORT,
INCORPORATED; LOCKHEED MARTIN SERVICES,
INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge. (1:06-cv-00141-JCC)

Submitted: June 15, 2007

Decided: June 19, 2007

Before WIDENER, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jason H. Ehrenberg, BAILEY & EHRENBERG, PLLC, Washington, D.C., for Appellant. John B. Flood, OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C., Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Shelton appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of his former employer, Lockheed Martin Operations Support, Inc., on his claim of retaliation brought under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2000), and 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (2000). 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); Evans v. Technologies Applications & Serv. Co., 80 F.3d 954, 958 (4th Cir. 1996). We have thoroughly reviewed the briefs and joint appendix and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Shelton v. Lockheed Martin Operations, Inc., No. 1:06-cv-00141-JCC (E.D. Va. Nov. 20, 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 decision making process.

AFFIRMED