

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-1204

MICHAEL U. OBEYA, Individually and t/a Myke
Services,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BRITISH SCHOOL OF WASHINGTON,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Marvin J. Garbis, Senior District Judge.
(CA-01-3158-MJG)

Submitted: July 21, 2004

Decided: August 9, 2004

Before MICHAEL and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Fatai A. Suleman, AMOROW & KUM, P.A., Takoma Park, Maryland, for
Appellant. Alan M. Schwartz, Columbia, Maryland; Geoffrey H.
Genth, KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael U. Obeya appeals a district court judgment granting summary judgment to the British School of Washington ("School") and dismissing his complaint raising allegations under 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (2000) and charging the School with tortious interference with contract and unjust enrichment.* Finding no error, 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 genuine issues of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 324-25 (1986). All factual evidence, and all justifiable inferences drawn therefrom, must be viewed in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986). However, the non-moving party may not rely upon mere allegations. Rather, supported by affidavits or other verified evidence, his response must set forth specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e); Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323 (1986); Cray Communications,

*Obeya does not challenge the district court's early dismissal of the unjust enrichment claim.

Inc. v. Novatel Computer Sys., Inc., 33 F.3d 390, 393-94 (4th Cir. 1994).

We affirm the judgment on the reasoning of the district court. See Obeya v. British Sch. of Wash., No. CA-01-3158-MJG (D. Md. Jan. 7, 2004). 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