

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1846

ELLEN PRITCHARD, formerly known as Ellen
Evans,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

WAL-MART STORES, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Chief Dis-
trict Judge. (CA-99-395-3-17)

Submitted: December 15, 2000

Decided: February 7, 2001

Before LUTTIG, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Charles L. Griffin, III, Kristi F. Curtis, BRYAN, BAHNMULLER,
GOLDMAN & MCELVEEN, L.L.P., Sumter, South Carolina, for Appellant.
J.R. Murphy, J.J. Gentry, MURPHY & GRANTLAND, P.A., Columbia, South
Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Ellen Pritchard, formerly Ellen Evans, appeals the district court's orders granting summary judgment to the Defendant and denying her motion for reconsideration on her claims of false imprisonment, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and defamation. The cause of action was removed to district court based on diversity of citizenship. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion de novo. See Higgins v. E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Finding no reversible error, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Pritchard v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., No. CA-99-395-3-17 (D.S.C. May 26, 2000).

We review the denial of the motion for reconsideration for abuse of discretion. United States v. Holland, 214 F.3d 523, 527 (4th Cir. 2000); Collison v. International Chem. Workers Union, 34 F.3d 233, 236 (4th Cir. 1994). When the motion raises no new arguments, but merely requests the district court to reconsider a legal issue or to "change its mind," relief is not authorized. United States v. Williams, 674 F.2d 310, 312 (4th Cir. 1982). We have reviewed the record as to the motion for reconsideration and we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequate-

ly presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED