

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1791

MARGARET WOOD CHASSE, individually and as personal representative for the estate of Russell Stephen Chasse,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 00-2105

MARGARET WOOD CHASSE, individually and as personal representative for the estate of Russell Stephen Chasse,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Margaret B. Seymour, District Judge. (CA-97-3511-8, CA-97-3511-7)

Submitted: April 17, 2001

Decided: October 16, 2001

Before LUTTIG and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Carole D. Moede, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellant. Stuart E. Schiffer, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, J. Rene Josey, United States Attorney, Robert S. Greenspan, E. Roy Hawken, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In No. 00-1791, Margaret Wood Chasse appeals the district court's order finding that she had not established the essential elements of her negligence claim under the Federal Tort Claims Act. To the extent the district court found that Mrs. Chasse failed to establish proximate cause, our review of the materials before us discloses no reversible error, and we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Chasse v. United States, No. CA-97-3511-8 (D.S.C. May 15, 2000).

In No. 00-2105, Mrs. Chasse appeals the award of costs to the United States pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(1). We have reviewed the record and the district court's order and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Chasse v. United States, No. CA-97-3511-7 (D.S.C. July 6, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED