

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 96-2715

---

JERRYL A. MARTIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

AIRBORNE EXPRESS; AMERICAN AIRLINES, INCORPORATED; AMR SERVICES CORPORATION; AMR DISTRIBUTION SYS; DAVID CHALK, individually and in his corporate officer capacity as General Manager of AMR Freight Distribution and Servicing within the Raleigh Division; RON HILL, individually and in his corporate officer capacity as Supervisor of AMR Freight Distribution and Servicing within the Raleigh Division; JOSEPH GNEISER, individually and in his corporate officer capacity as Manager of Airborne Freight Distribution and Servicing within the Raleigh Division,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (CA-95-1041-5-BR)

---

Submitted: April 28, 1998

Decided: July 24, 1998

---

Before WILKINS, LUTTIG, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jerryl A. Martin, Appellant Pro Se. Paul K. Sun, Jr., SMITH, HELMS, MULLISS & MOORE, Raleigh, North Carolina; Weyman Thompson Johnson, Jr., Anthony Craig Cleland, PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER, Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Jerryl A. Martin appeals a district court order granting Defendants' motion for summary judgment and denying Martin's motion for cross summary judgment in an action alleging violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act, the North Carolina Wage and Hour Act, and 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (1994), and claiming intentional infliction of emotional distress and breach of contract.

We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Martin v. Airborne Express, No. CA-95-1041-5-BR (E.D.N.C. Nov. 8, 1996). 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