

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-2035

RACHEL A. ROYER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SYNEOS HEALTH, LLC,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at
Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:25-cv-00046-FL)

Submitted: April 23, 2026

Decided: April 27, 2026

Before NIEMEYER, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: K.E. Krispen Culbertson, CULBERTSON & ASSOCIATES, Greensboro,
North Carolina, for Appellant. Haseeb Fatmi, Tatiana M. Terry, OGLETREE, DEAKINS,
NASH, SMOAK & STEWART P.C., Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rachel A. Royer appeals the district court's order granting Defendant's motion to dismiss Royer's civil action alleging Defendant failed to accommodate her religious beliefs, in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17, and raising federal constitutional and state law fraud claims. We have considered the arguments raised on appeal, in conjunction with the record and the relevant authorities, and we discern no reversible error.

Specifically, we find that the district court correctly found that Royer failed to establish that extraordinary circumstances beyond her control prevented her from complying with the 90-day statutory time limit applicable to her Title VII claim. *See Rouse v. Lee*, 339 F.3d 238, 246 (4th Cir. 2003)). We also find that the district court correctly dismissed Royer's remaining claims. *See, e.g., Xia Bi v. McAuliffe*, 927 F.3d 177, 184 (4th Cir. 2019) ("Reasonable, detrimental reliance upon a misrepresentation is an essential element of a cause of action for fraud and . . . must be pleaded with particularity." (internal quotation marks, alteration, and ellipses omitted)); *Sykes v. Health Network Sols., Inc.*, 828 S.E.2d 467, 469 (N.C. 2019) (observing that North Carolina has "no freestanding claim . . . for punitive damages").

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Royer v. Syneos Health, LLC*, No. 5:25-cv-00046-FL (E.D.N.C. Aug. 12, 2025). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED