

Filed: February 17, 1999

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

Nos. 98-2392(L)
(CA-97-1534-A, CA-97-1859-A)

Bryant C. Brooks,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

Burlington Coat Factory, etc., et al,

Defendants - Appellees.

O R D E R

The court amends its opinion filed December 30, 1998, as follows:

On page 2, section 1, line 2 -- the judge's name is corrected to read "Theresa Carroll Buchanan, Magistrate Judge."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Patricia S. Connor
Clerk

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2392

BRYANT C. BROOKS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY WAREHOUSE OF STERLING
PARK, INCORPORATED; TYRONE E. GIBSON, Manager,
Burlington Coat Factory; CHARLES E. HAYES,
JR., Security, Burlington Coat Factory; MONROE
MILSTEIN,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 98-2402

BRYANT C. BROOKS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

TYRONE E. GIBSON, Manager, Burlington Coat
Factory; CHARLES E. HAYES, JR., Security,
Burlington Coat Factory; MONROE MILSTEIN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Theresa Carroll Buchanan, Magistrate Judge. (CA-97-1534-A, CA-97-1859-A)

Submitted: December 17, 1998 Decided: December 30, 1998

Before WILKINS, NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Bryant C. Brooks, Appellant Pro Se. Joy Cummings Fuhr, Kimberly Rose Hillman, MCGUIRE, WOODS, BATTLE & BOOTHE, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Bryant C. Brooks appeals the district court's orders granting summary judgment to the Defendants and dismissing his civil actions. We have reviewed the records and the district court's opinions and orders and find no reversible errors. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Brooks v. Burlington Coat Factory, Nos. CA-97-1534-A; CA-97-1859-A (E.D. Va. Jul. 17, 1998 & Jul. 23, 1998). 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