

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

No. 15-7035

September Term, 2015

FILED ON: JANUARY 21, 2016

TAMIKA EDMONDS,

APPELLANT

v.

ENGILITY CORPORATION,

APPELLEE

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia
(No. 1:13-cv-00893)

Before: BROWN, *Circuit Judge*, and EDWARDS and WILLIAMS, *Senior Circuit Judges*.

J U D G M E N T

This appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Columbia's order granting defendant's motion for summary judgment was presented to the court and briefed and argued by counsel. The court has accorded the issues full consideration and has determined that they do not warrant a published opinion. See D.C. CIR. R. 36(d). It is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the decision of the District Court be affirmed for the reasons stated by the District Court. See *Edmonds v. Engility Corp.*, 82 F. Supp. 3d 337 (D.D.C. 2015). We agree with the District Court that Edmonds has not produced sufficient evidence to permit a reasonable inference that Engility's explanation for Edmonds's termination—that the company replaced Edmonds's payroll position with an accountant position to address problems with a new accounting system—was pretext for discrimination, retaliation, or unlawful interference with Edmonds's right to maternity leave. While Edmonds raised several arguments that the District Court did not expressly address, these arguments are immaterial because they do not, even taken as a whole and combined with the other evidence invoked by Edmonds, give rise to a reasonable inference of pretext.

Pursuant to Rule 36 of this court, this disposition will not be published. The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the mandate herein until seven days after the

No. 15-7035

Page 2

disposition of any timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing *en banc*. See FED. R. APP. P. 41(b); D.C. CIR. R. 41.

Per Curiam

FOR THE COURT:

Mark J. Langer, Clerk

BY: /s/

Ken Meadows

Deputy Clerk