UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

	No. 17-1431	
DEBRA BASS,		
Plaintiff - App	pellant,	
v.		
WAL-MART STORES, INC.,		
Defendant - A	ppellee.	
Appeal from the United States D Danville. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior		_
Submitted: September 29, 2017		Decided: October 13, 2017
Before KING and FLOYD, Circuit	Judges, and HAMIL	TON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Affirmed by unpublished per curia	m opinion.	
Mark T. Williams, WILLIAMS, Virginia, for Appellant. Cathlee ROBINSON & CATHEY PLC, Ro	n Kailani Memmer	, Victor S. Skaff, III, GLENN
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Debra Bass appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., in her personal injury action. "[W]e review de novo the district court's order granting summary judgment." Jacobs v. N.C. Admin. Office of the Courts, 780 F.3d 562, 565 n.1 (4th Cir. 2015). "A district court 'shall grant summary judgment 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." Id. at 568 (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a)). "A dispute is genuine if a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party." Id. (internal quotation marks omitted). In determining whether a genuine issue of material fact exists, "we view the facts and all justifiable inferences arising therefrom in the light most favorable to . . . the nonmoving party." *Id.* at 565 n.1 (internal quotation marks omitted). However, "the nonmoving party must rely on more than conclusory allegations, mere speculation, the building of one inference upon another, or the mere existence of a scintilla of evidence." Dash v. Mayweather, 731 F.3d 303, 311 (4th Cir. 2013).

We have thoroughly reviewed the parties' briefs and the materials in the joint appendix and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Bass v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, No. 4:16-cv-00033-JLK-RSB (W.D. Va. Mar. 9, 2017).

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