

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-1213

JOHN COOKE WILSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

PRESIDENT, TIME, INCORPORATED; BRIAN WOLFE,
Director of Consumer Marketing Time,
Incorporated; E. MATTHEWS, Director of
Sweepstakes Time, Incorporated; W. J. MILLER,
Director of Sweepstakes Time, Incorporated;
PRESIDENT, VENTURA ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED;
PRESIDENT, SPORTS ILLUSTRATED MAGAZINE;
GUARANTEED & BONDED SWEEPSTAKES III; TIME
CUSTOMER SERVICE, INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Aiken. G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge.
(CA-00-2293-1-13AK)

Submitted: May 21, 2002

Decided: June 11, 2002

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Cooke Wilson, Appellant Pro Se. Frank Rogers Ellerbee, III, ROBINSON, MCFADDEN & MOORE, P.C., Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

John Cooke Wilson appeals the district court's order adopting the report and recommendation of a magistrate judge granting Appellees' motion for summary judgment and dismissing Wilson's action. On appeal, Wilson contends that the district court erred by dismissing his claims of fraud, perjury, and conspiracy stemming from a magazine sweepstakes promotion.* Finding no error, we affirm.

We review an award of summary judgment de novo. Higgins v. E. I. Dupont de Nemours & Co., 863 F.2d 1162, 1167 (4th Cir. 1988). Summary judgment is appropriate when "the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-49 (1986). In determining whether the moving party has shown that there is no genuine issue of material fact, we assess the factual evidence and all inferences to be drawn therefrom in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Id. at 255; Smith v. Va. Commonwealth Univ., 84 F.3d 672, 675 (4th Cir. 1996).

* Wilson raised several other claims in his original complaint, but he failed to raise those claims on appeal. Therefore, he has waived review of those claims. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b).

We have reviewed Wilson's claims and find them meritless. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Wilson v. President, Time, Inc., No. CA-00-2293-1-13AK (D.S.C. Dec. 7, 2001). 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