

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-11224
Non-Argument Calendar

FILED U.S. COURT OF APPEALS ELEVENTH CIRCUIT SEPTEMBER 14, 2010 JOHN LEY CLERK

D. C. Docket No. 3:09-cv-00074-HES-TEM

JUDITH K. MEISENHELDER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

FLORIDA COASTAL SCHOOL OF LAW, INC.,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Florida

(September 14, 2010)

Before TJOFLAT, MARCUS and FAY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

This case stems from appellant's dismissal from appellee's law school for

failing to maintain the required minimum grade point average. In a two-count complaint, appellant claimed that appellee discriminated against her in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act by failing to make reasonable accommodations for her disabilities. As the district court noted in its February 18, 2010 order granting appellee's motion for summary judgment, appellant "had a long history of migraine headaches and suffered from depression." Order at 2. She also suffered from "an eating disorder." Id.

The district court's summary judgment order lays out the salient facts regarding appellant's relationship with appellee's law school over a period that extended from the fall of 2004 to her dismissal from the school in the late summer of 2008. The district court concluded, on the basis of those facts, that appellant failed to establish that she suffered from a disability as defined by the ADA or Section 504. The court went one step further and assuming that appellant had established such disability, she failed to show that appellee failed reasonably to accommodate it.

We discern no error in the district court's disposition of appellant's claims.

We therefore affirm its judgment.¹

AFFIRMED.

¹ Appellant claims in her brief that the district court erred when it failed to address her claim that appellee retaliated against her following her formal request for an accommodation of her disabilities. Appellant's complaint did not present the claim; thus, the court committed no error in failing to consider it.