

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

ANTONIA M. ALLEN-SESKER;
JACQUELINE COLEMAN; CHARMAINE
CRAWFORD-HOLLY; BELINDA DICKENS-
LONG; TYO HODGINS; BARBARA
LAMBRIGHT; VARNETTA MOSES;
GLORIA REAL; ANDRI STEWART;
GERALDINE STANCIL; CAROL D.
WILLIS; CASSANDRA A. GRIER,
Plaintiffs-Appellants.

v.

No. 99-1536

BELL ATLANTIC GLOBAL WIRELESS,
INCORPORATED, t/a Chesapeake
Directory Sales Company; GTEX
CORPORATION; BARRY VAN RY,
Individually and as President-CEO;
STANLEY HAAS; JAMES R. WALLIS,
Individually and as Vice President-
Human Resources; E. JOSEPH
CROSNEY,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt.
Peter J. Messitte, District Judge.
(CA-97-2820-PJM)

Submitted: September 30, 1999

Decided: November 2, 1999

Before WILKINS, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

George Hermina, John Hermina, HERMINA LAW GROUP, Laurel, Maryland, for Appellants. Harry T. Jones, Jr., William P. Flanagan, HOGAN & HARTSON, L.L.P., Washington, D.C., for Appellees.
yhddy

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

The Appellants appeal from the district court's order denying their motion for a continuance pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(f) and dismissing their civil action alleging racial discrimination and retaliation in employment filed under 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (1994) and 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (1994). The Appellants also assign error to the district court's order affirming the magistrate judge's denial of three discovery-related motions and the court's refusal to issue preliminary injunctive relief. Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

In light of the Appellants' failure to describe with any specificity the additional discovery required, we find that the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the Rule 56(f) motion. See Nguyen v. CNA Corp., 44 F.3d 234, 242 (4th Cir. 1995). Neither did the court abuse its nearly "unfettered" discretion in denying Appellants' untimely discovery motions. Hinkle v. City of Clarksburg, 81 F.3d 416, 426 (4th Cir. 1996). To the extent that it may have been error to deny the Appellants' motion to determine the sufficiency of the Appellees' untimely response to the Appellants' request for admissions, we find that the error was harmless. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 61. See

Beatty v. United States, 983 F.2d 908, 909 (8th Cir. 1993); Gutting v. Falstaff Brewing Corp., 710 F.2d 1309, 1313 (8th Cir. 1983). Finally, we conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion in declining to award preliminary injunctive relief to the Appellants. See Planned Parenthood v. Camblos, 155 F.3d 352, 359 (4th Cir. 1998) (en banc), cert. denied, ___ U.S. ___, 67 U.S.L.W. 3364 (U.S. Feb. 22, 1999) (No. 98-834).

The district court's orders are affirmed. 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