

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 07-1988

JOHNNY D. THORNTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 07-2097

JOHNNY D. THORNTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (1:06-cv-00397-GBL)

Submitted: July 2, 2008

Decided: July 21, 2008

Before MOTZ and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and WILKINS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher D. Vaughn, MELVILLE JOHNSON, P.C., Atlanta, Georgia, for Appellant. Chuck Rosenberg, United States Attorney, Dennis C. Barghaan, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals,* Johnny D. Thornton appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to his former employer in his action alleging violations of § 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, 29 U.S.C. § 794(a) (2000), and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e - 2000e-17 (2000). This court reviews a district court's order granting summary judgment de novo, viewing the facts and drawing reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. Doe v. Kidd, 501 F.3d 348, 353 (4th Cir. 2007), cert. denied, 128 S. Ct. 1483 (2008). Summary judgment is proper "if the pleadings, the discovery and disclosure materials on file, and any affidavits show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law." Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); see Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986). With these standards in mind, we have thoroughly reviewed the briefs and the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court Thornton v. Mukasey, No. 1:06-cv-00397-GBL (E.D. Va. filed Aug. 27, 2007; entered Aug. 29, 2007). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in

*The multiple appeals result from the fact that Thornton and his counsel each filed a separate notice of appeal from the final order of the district court.

the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED