United States Court of Appeals

For the Eighth Circuit

	No. 17-1009	
	Dr. John Gray	
	Plaintiff - Appellan	t
	v.	
Welch Motor Company, In	c., doing business as Welch-Nis Welch, Owner	ssan Motors, Inc.; David
	Defendants - Appelle	es
	No. 17-1227	
	Dr. John Gray	
	Plaintiff - Appellan	t
	V.	
Welch Motor Company, In	c., doing business as Welch-Nis Welch, Owner	ssan Motors, Inc.; David
	Defendants - Appelle	es
	Is from United States District Constern District of Arkansas - Pindo	

Submitted: August 7, 2017 Filed: August 10, 2017 [Unpublished]

Before WOLLMAN, BEAM, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Welch Motor Company hired Dr. John Gray as a salesperson in July 2014. Less than one month later, Welch Motor's sales manager terminated Gray's employment in part because Gray would frequently leave work to attend to personal errands. Gray sued Welch Motor, raising claims under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1126(h), (i) and 1117), the Arkansas Deceptive Trade Practices Act (ADTPA) (Ark. Code § 4-88-101 et seq.), and the Arkansas Civil Rights Act (Ark. Code § 16-123-107), alleging various acts of race-based discrimination and unfair trade practices.

The district court¹ denied various of Gray's discovery motions and requests, and ultimately granted summary judgment in favor of Welch Motor on all of Gray's claims. We have carefully reviewed all of Gray's appellate arguments, the pleadings, and record evidence in this matter. Cognizant of the standards of review and reviewing the facts in the light most favorable to Gray, giving him the benefit of all reasonable inferences, Edwards v. Hiland Roberts Dairy, Co., 860 F.3d 1121, 1125 (8th Cir. 2017) (grant of summary judgment reviewed de novo); Hudson Enters, Inc. v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London Ins. Cos., 855 F.3d 874, 877 (8th Cir. 2017) ("We review a district court's 'discovery rulings in a manner both narrow and deferential, and reversal is only warranted if an erroneous ruling amounted to a gross

¹The Honorable James M. Moody, Jr., United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

abuse of discretion." (quoting <u>Robinson v. Potter</u>, 453 F.3d 990, 994-95 (8th Cir. 2006))), we affirm the district court for the reasons stated in its analyses and orders. <u>See</u> 8th Cir. R. 47B.

-3-