

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 26-1041

SAIRA GHUMMAN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BOEING INTELLIGENCE & ANALYTICS, INC.,

Defendant – Appellee.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION,

Amicus Supporting Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Stephanie A. Gallagher, District Judge. (1:23-cv-03371-SAG)

Submitted: July 23, 2026

Decided: July 28, 2026

Before WYNN and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Saira Ghumman, Appellant Pro Se. Michael Joseph Murphy, Washington, D.C., William Ryan Waddell, OGLETREE DEAKINS, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee. Steven John Winkelman, Office of General Counsel, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

COMMISSION, Washington, D.C., for Amicus Curiae.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Saira Ghumman appeals the district court's order ruling on multiple motions including, most relevant here, Defendant's summary judgment motion on Ghumman's race and color discrimination claims, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) has filed an amicus curiae brief supporting Ghumman, asserting that the district court applied incorrect standards in analyzing whether Ghumman suffered an actionable adverse employment action.*

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Ghumman's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, she has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Ghumman v. Boeing Intel. & Analytics, Inc.*, No. 1:23-cv-03371-SAG (D. Md. Dec. 10, 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

* Since we may decide this appeal without reaching the question the EEOC raises on appeal, we render no opinion as to the district court's "adverse employment action" analysis. We also deny Defendant's "Motion to Disregard [Ghumman's] Informal Rely Brief."