



2020 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

1-29-2020

Dorothy Stewart v. Postmaster General US

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2020

Recommended Citation

"Dorothy Stewart v. Postmaster General US" (2020). *2020 Decisions*. 93.
https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2020/93

This January is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2020 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 18-3262

DOROTHY M. STEWART, on behalf of
herself and all others similarly situated,
Appellant

v.

POSTMASTER GENERAL UNITED STATES

On Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of New Jersey
(District Court No. 3-17-cv-00167)
District Judge: Honorable Brian R. Martinotti

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)
July 8, 2019

Before: McKEE, ROTH, and RENDELL, *Circuit Judges*.

(Opinion filed: January 29, 2020)

OPINION*

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

McKEE, *Circuit Judge*.

Dorothy Stewart appeals the district court’s granting of Megan J. Brennan’s motion to dismiss. As the district court explains, by signing the Claim Form and Release in the *Pittman* class action on June 14, 2014, Stewart released “any right ... to appeal the [s]ettlement [a]greement to the EEOC, any right ... to file a civil action in a federal court related to the claims in this case, and any other right [she] might have to seek relief for a claim included within the *Pittman* class action.”¹

The district court’s well-reasoned opinion more than adequately addresses this and Stewart’s related claims, and we will therefore affirm substantially for the reasons set forth in that opinion.

¹ *Stewart v. Brennan*, 2018 WL 1377310