

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 10-2870

---

LAUREEN M. BOLES,

Appellant

v.

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA WATER DEPARTMENT

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania  
(Civ. No. 2-06-cv-01609)  
District Judge: Hon. Stewart Dalzell

Submitted pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)  
Tuesday, May 24, 2011

Before: McKEE, *Chief Judge*, SCIRICA and RENDELL, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed: June 29, 2011)

---

OPINION

---

McKEE, *Chief Judge*.

Laureen M. Boles appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of Defendant City of Philadelphia on the claims she brought under Title VII and Pennsylvania's Human Relations Act. For the reasons set forth below, we will affirm.

Because we write primarily for the parties, we need not repeat the facts or procedural history of this case. Moreover, the district court has ably summarized the relevant background. *See Boles v. City of Phila. Water Dept.*, 2010 WL 2044473 (E.D. Pa. May 21, 2010). On appeal, Boles argues that the district court erred: (1) when it granted summary judgment to the City of Philadelphia on her claim that she was subject to disparate treatment on account of her race; and (2) when it failed to consider claims of retaliation and hostile work environment, which did not appear in Boles's complaint. Those claims were raised in Boles' response to the City's motion for summary judgment.

In his detailed and thoughtful opinion, Judge Dalzell carefully and clearly explained his reasons for granting the City's motion for summary judgment. *See id.* We can add little to Judge Dalzell's analysis and discussion and we will therefore affirm the district court's order for substantially the same reasons as set forth in that opinion.