

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-1269

GLENN R. SCAGGS; JAMIE SCAGGS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

MCGINNIS BROTHERS, INCORPORATED, d/b/a
McCorkle Machine & Engineering, a West
Virginia Corporation,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

SULZER METCO (US) INCORPORATED, a foreign corporation with offices in New York; EUTECTIC CORPORATION, a foreign corporation with offices in Illinois; WALL COLMONOY CORPORATION, a foreign corporation with offices in Michigan; ERVIN INDUSTRIES, a foreign corporation with offices in Michigan; BARNSTEEL ABRASIVES, a foreign corporation with offices in Pennsylvania; PEERLESS METAL POWDERS & ABRASIVES, INCORPORATED, a foreign corporation with offices in Michigan; GLOBE STEEL ABRASIVES, a foreign corporation with offices in Ohio; STEEL ABRASIVES, INCORPORATED, a foreign corporation with offices in Ohio; BAY STATE ABRASIVES, INCORPORATED, a foreign corporation with offices in Massachusetts; STELLITE COATINGS, a division of Deloro Stellite Company, Incorporated, a foreign corporation with offices in Indiana; OMG AMERICAS, INCORPORATED, formerly known as SCM Metal Products, Incorporated, a foreign corporation with offices in North Carolina,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Huntington. Joseph Robert Goodwin, District Judge. (CA-99-819)

Submitted: August 13, 2002

Decided: September 20, 2002

Before NIEMEYER, LUTTIG, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

David Harley Carriger, LAW OFFICES OF STUART CALWELL, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellants. Jay M. Potter, SCHUMACHER, FRANCIS & NELSON, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Glenn R. Scaggs and Jamie Scaggs appeal the district court's order granting Defendants summary judgment. 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. See Scaggs v. McGinnis Bros., Inc., No. CA-99-819 (S.D.W. Va. Jan. 31, 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