## [DO NOT PUBLISH]

## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

| FOR T   | THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT                  |  |
|---|---------------------------------------|--|
|   |                                       | FILED<br>U.S. COURT OF APPEAL                              |
| N   | No. 11-12149<br>Ion-Argument Calendar | ELEVENTH CIRCUIT<br>DECEMBER 19, 2011<br>JOHN LEY<br>CLERK |
| D. C. Docket No. 1:09-cv-02046-VEH  |                                       |  |
| CLAUDIA SMITH, LACRYS et al.,   | TA, SCOTT,                            |  |
| Plaintiffs-Appellants,  |                                       |  |
| versus  |                                       |  |
| WESTERN SIZZLIN CORPO<br>INVESTORS MANAGEMEN<br>d.b.a. Western Sizzlin Oxford,    | T, LLC,                               |  |
|   | Defendants-Appellees.                 |  |
| Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Alabama |                                       |  |
|   | (December 19, 2011)                   |  |
| Before DUBINA, Chief Judge  | , MARCUS and MARTIN,                  | Circuit Judges.  |
| PER CURIAM:   |                                       |  |

This is an appeal from a district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of defendants on all of plaintiffs' claims except the breach of contract claim brought by certain plaintiffs. The breach of contract claim was tried to the district court without a jury, after which the court issued a memorandum decision and final judgment in favor of the defendants. The plaintiffs have also appealed that judgment.

In their amended complaint, the plaintiffs asserted claims for breach of contract, race discrimination in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1981, intentional infliction of emotional distress, negligent supervision and negligent training, and false imprisonment. In addition, all of the plaintiffs, except Keaton Williams, asserted a claim of liable. Plaintiff, DeVion Smith, asserted a claim of disability discrimination under 42 U.S.C. § 12101.

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(a), summary judgment is proper "if the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). We review the district court's order granting summary judgment *de novo*, drawing all inferences in the light most vavorable to the non-moving party. *Owens v. J.C. Sys., Inc.*, 629 F.3d 1263, 1270 (11th Cir. 2011).

After reviewing the record and reading the parties' briefs, we affirm the district court's grant of summary judgment based on its thorough and well-reasoned memorandum opinion filed on October 28, 2010.

Concerning the breach of contract claim arising out of the baby shower that was held at the Western Sizzlin in Oxford, Alabama, we affirm the district court's final judgment entered in favor of the defendants based on the court's findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in its well-reasoned memorandum decision filed on April 13, 2011.

## AFFIRMED.