

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-6055**

---

GEORGE E. CARTER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. David C. Norton, District Judge. (CA-02-880-18-0)

---

Submitted: February 25, 2003

Decided: March 14, 2003

---

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

George E. Carter, Appellant Pro Se. Barbara Murcier Bowens, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

George E. Carter appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's report and recommendation and granting summary judgment in favor of the United States on Carter's claims brought under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2671, 1346(b) (2000). We affirm.

We review a grant 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 only if there are no material facts in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). This Court must view the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986).

With these standards in mind, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Carter v. United States, No. CA-02-880-18-0 (D.S.C. Dec. 13, 2002). 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