

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 10-1254**

---

MICHAEL FORD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES MANSFIELD, Esq.,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

ZALCO REALTY, INCORPORATED; MDV MAINTENANCE, INCORPORATED;  
HORIZON HOUSE CONDOMINIUM UNIT OWNERS; DAVID FAISON; ERIC  
MUCKLOW; VIRGINIA A. SMITH,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District  
Judge. (1:08-cv-01318-LO-TRJ)

---

Submitted: December 20, 2010

Decided: January 12, 2011

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Lynne Bernabei, Alan R. Kabat, Andrea Loveless, Peter M. Whelan,  
BERNABEI & WACHTEL, PLLC, Washington, D.C.; Michael L. Foreman,  
PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, University Park, Pennsylvania;  
Sarah Crawford, LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, Washington,

D.C., for Appellant. David D. Hudgins, Robert E. Draim, Reese A. Pearson, HUDGINS LAW FIRM, P.C., Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Ford appeals the district court's order granting James Mansfield's summary judgment motion on Ford's 42 U.S.C. § 1981 (2006) claims alleging racial discrimination and harassment, and granting Mansfield's motion to strike Ford's claim for emotional distress damages. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order.\* Ford v. Mansfield, No. 1:08-cv-01318-LO-TRJ (E.D. Va. filed Feb. 1, 2010; entered Feb. 2, 2010). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\* Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the district court incorrectly analyzed Ford's § 1981 discrimination claim against Mansfield as a wrongful termination claim rather than an interference with contractual relations claim, given the paucity of direct or circumstantial evidence that Mansfield's actions were taken because of Ford's race, we affirm the district court's decision to grant Mansfield summary judgment. See Suter v. United States, 441 F.3d 306, 310 (4th Cir. 2006) (reiterating that the court may affirm on any grounds apparent from the record).