Not for Publication in West's Federal Reporter

United States Court of AppealsFor the First Circuit

No. 15-2556

NANCY LEE BAILEY,

Plaintiff, Appellant,

v.

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS, LLP and SEAN ANGLES,

Defendants, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Hon. Denise J. Casper, U.S. District Judge]

Before

Howard, <u>Chief Judge</u>, Selya and Kayatta, Circuit Judges.

Christopher J. Trombetta for appellant.

 $\underline{\text{Mark W. Batten}}$, with whom $\underline{\text{Proskauer Rose LLP}}$ was on brief, for $\underline{\text{Pricewaterhousecoopers}}$, $\underline{\text{LLP}}$.

Andrew T. O'Connor, Joshua M. Davis, Kelly A. Schwartz, and Goulston & Storrs PC on brief for Sean Angles.

September 19, 2016

PER CURIAM. After careful review of the briefs and consideration of oral arguments in this matter, we summarily affirm the district court's entry of summary judgment for defendants on plaintiff's state-law retaliation claim.\(^1\) See Bailey v. Pricewaterhousecoopers, LLP, No. 1:14-cv-10141 (D. Mass. Nov. 18, 2015); lst Cir. R. 27.0(c). We agree with the district court that there was insufficient record evidence to support the conclusion that Defendant-Appellee Sean Angles, the sole alleged retaliator in this case, was aware of plaintiff's protected activity when he engaged in the allegedly retaliatory conduct. See, e.g., Ponte v. Steelcase Inc., 741 F.3d 310, 323 n.11 (1st Cir. 2014). Because we affirm on this basis, we need not address the other aspects of the district court's reasoning.

¹ Plaintiff does not challenge any other aspect of the district court's ruling on appeal.