

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-1191

HENRY L. HOWELL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NETWORK SOLUTIONS, INCORPORATED; PHILLIP L.
SHARBARO; JEFFREY W. JOHNSON; DAVID GRAVES;
VERISIGN, INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District
Judge. (CA-02-632-A)

Submitted: December 10, 2003

Decided: December 24, 2003

Before WILKINSON, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher E. Brown, BROWN, BROWN & BROWN, P.C., Alexandria,
Virginia, for Appellant. Larry R. Seegull, PIPER RUDNICK, L.L.P.,
Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Henry L. Howell filed an action alleging that he was discriminated against in his employment in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. Howell appeals from the district court's order granting summary judgment to his employer and denying his discovery motions. We have reviewed the record and do not find that the district court improperly granted summary judgment, see Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986) (articulating review standard for appeal of summary judgment motions), or abused its discretion in denying Howell's discovery motions. See Wells v. Liddy, 186 F.3d 505, 518 n.12 (4th Cir. 1999) (providing general review standard for discovery management); Evans v. Techs. Applications & Serv. Co., 80 F.3d 954, 962 (4th Cir. 1996) (giving review standard for ruling on motion to strike affidavits). Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Howell v. Networking Solutions, Inc., No. CA-02-632-A (E.D. Va. filed Jan. 8, 2003 & entered Jan. 13, 2003) (granting summary judgment to the employer for the reasons as stated on the bench). 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