UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2393

PHYLLIS E. NORRIS, Administratrix of the Estate of Chester Cecil Norris,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

EXCEL INDUSTRIES, INC.,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Harrisonburg. Michael F. Urbanski, District Judge. (5:14-cv-00029-MFU-RSB)

Submitted: June 21, 2016 Decided: July 5, 2016

Before SHEDD, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John D. Gehlhausen, JOHN GEHLHAUSEN, P.C., Aurora, Colorado; David M. Kopstein, KOPSTEIN & ASSOCIATES, LLC, Searbrook, Maryland, for Appellant. C. Dewayne Lonas, Matthew J. Hundley, MORAN REEVES & CONN, PC, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Phyllis E. Norris appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of the Appellee on Norris' negligence claims related to the allegedly defective design and inadequate warnings of the Appellee's product. Norris also challenges on appeal the district court's order denying her motion to reconsider the magistrate judge's order allowing the Appellee to designate certain documents as confidential under a previously entered protective order. We review de novo a district court's order granting summary judgment, viewing facts in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. Newport News Holdings Corp. v. Virtual City Vision, Inc., 650 F.3d 423, 435 (4th Cir. 2011). Summary judgment should be granted "if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). "'[T]here is no issue for trial unless there is sufficient evidence favoring the nonmoving party for a jury to return a verdict for that party.'" Newport News, 650 F.3d at 435 (quoting Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 249-50 (1986)).

We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Norris v. Excel Indus., Inc., No. 5:14-cv-00029-MFU-RBU (W.D. Va. Oct. 19, 2015). We dispense with oral argument

because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED