UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 16-2180				
CX REINSURANCE COMPANY Reinsurance Company Limited,	Y LIMITED,	formerly	known	as	CNA
Plaintiff - Appel	lee,				
v.					
BRAYON J. LOYAL,					
Defendant - App	pellant,				
and					
STEWART J. LEVITAS,					
Defendant.					
	No. 16-2228				
CX REINSURANCE COMPANY Reinsurance Company Limited,	Y LIMITED,	formerly	known	as	CNA
Plaintiff - Appel	lant,				
v.					
BRAYON J. LOYAL,					
Defendant - App	pellee,				

and

STEWART J. LEVITAS,

Defendant.	
Appeals from the United States Dis James K. Bredar, District Judge. (1	strict Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. :15-cv-02174-JKB)
Submitted: May 31, 2017	Decided: June 6, 2017
Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and I	KEENAN, Circuit Judges.
No. 16-2180 affirmed; No. 16-2228	3 dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.
	MEAGHER & ENOCH, Baltimore, Maryland, for t M.G. Seraina, Louis P. Malick, KRAMON & and, for Appellee/Cross-Appellant.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Brayon J. Loyal appeals the district court's order denying her motion for summary

judgment and granting summary judgment in favor of CX Reinsurance Company Ltd.

("CX Reinsurance"). CX Reinsurance cross-appeals from the same order by the district

court denying its motion to dismiss the action.

With respect to Loyal's appeal, we have reviewed the parties' briefs and the record

and, although we grant Loyal's motion to file the additional materials submitted with her

opening brief, we find no reversible error in the portion of the district court's order

granting summary judgment to CX Reinsurance. Accordingly, for the reasons stated by

the district court, we affirm the district court's order granting summary judgment. Loyal

v. CX Reinsurance Co., No. 1:15-cv-02174-JKB (D. Md. Sept. 15, 2016). Because we

affirm the district court's grant of summary judgment in CX Reinsurance's favor, we

dismiss as moot CX Reinsurance's cross-appeal of the denial of its motion to dismiss.

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.

No. 16-2180 *AFFIRMED*

No. 16-2228 DISMISSED

3