

[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-13779
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 2:13-cv-00580-WKW-SRW

ALABAMA GAS CORPORATION,

Plaintiff -
Counter Defendant -
Appellant -
Cross Appellee,

versus

GAS FITTERS LOCAL UNION NO. 548 OF
THE UNITED ASSOCIATION, AFL-CIO-CLC,

Defendant -
Counter Claimant -
Appellee -
Cross Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court
for the Middle District of Alabama

(April 10, 2015)

Before JORDAN, JILL PRYOR and DUBINA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

In its appeal, Alabama Gas Corporation (Algasco) challenges the district court's decision to exclude the expert testimony that it submitted in support of its motion for summary judgment as well as the district court's grant of summary judgment to Gas Fitters Local Union No. 548 of the United Association, AFL-CIO-CLC (Local 548) confirming an arbitration award. Local 548 cross-appeals the district court's denial of the union's request for attorney's fees and expenses, which it sought as a sanction against Algasco for pursuing this litigation challenging the arbitration award.

"We review confirmations of arbitration awards and denials of motions to vacate arbitration awards under the same standard, reviewing the district court's findings of fact for clear error and its legal conclusions *de novo*." *Frazier v. CitiFinancial Corp.*, 604 F.3d 1313, 1321 (11th Cir. 2010). We review the district court's exclusion of Algasco's expert testimony for abuse of discretion and will reverse the court's ruling only where it was manifestly erroneous. *Hughes v. Kia Motors Corp.*, 766 F.3d 1317, 1328 (11th Cir. 2014). We review the denial of

Local 548's request for attorney's fees for abuse of discretion. *Dionne v. Floormasters Enters., Inc.*, 667 F.3d 1199, 1203 (11th Cir. 2012).

After reviewing the record and reading the parties' briefs, we affirm the exclusion of Algasco's expert testimony, the summary judgment entered in favor of Local 548, and the denial of Local 548's request for attorney's fees based on the district court's well-reasoned opinion filed on July 23, 2014.

AFFIRMED.