UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-2282

DENISE WASHINGTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (2:05-cv-01949-DCN)

Submitted: November 16, 2007 Decided: December 18, 2007

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Chalmers C. Johnson, CHALMERS JOHNSON LAW FIRM, Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina, for Appellant. Allan Riley Holmes, GIBBS & HOLMES, Charleston, South Carolina; Vincent Miraglia, Carlos Enrique Provencio, INTERNATIONAL PAPER COMPANY, Memphis, Tennessee, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

PER CURIAM:

Denise Washington appeals the district court's order granting Defendant's summary judgment motion on her claims for wrongful discharge in violation of the Family and Medical Leave Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601-2654 (2000), and for breach of her employee handbook.* In accordance with 4th Cir. L. R. 45, we originally dismissed Washington's appeal for want of prosecution. Because Washington has shown good cause to excuse the late filing of her appellate brief and joint appendix, however, we recalled the mandate and granted her petition to reinstate her appeal by separate order. We have reviewed the record and affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Washington v. Int'l Paper Co., No. 2:05-cv-01949-DCN (D.S.C. filed Nov. 2, 2006; entered Nov. 3, 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

*Although Washington also asserted claims against the Defendant for wrongful termination in violation of South Carolina public policy and in violation of Defendant's anti-discrimination policy, Washington does not challenge the district court's dismissal of these claims.