

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2582

RORIE N. WILSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CBS CORPORATION, f/k/a Viacom, Inc., f/k/a Westinghouse
Electric Corporation,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

AC&S, INC.; AMCHEM PRODUCTS, INC.; C.E. THURSTON & SONS,
INC.; COMBUSTION ENGINEERING, INC.; DANA CORPORATION,
Individually & As a Successor in Liability to Smith
Kanzler; THE FLINTKOTE CO.; GENERAL REFRACTORIES COMPANY;
GEORGIA-PACIFIC CORPORATION; HALLIBURTON ENERGY SERVICES
CORP.; HONEYWELL, INC., agent of Allied-Signal, Inc.
(Formerly Allied Corporation) Successor-in-Interest to
Bendix Corporation; HOPEMAN BROTHERS, INC.; INTERNATIONAL
MINERALS & CHEMICAL CORP., now known as I.M.C. Corporation;
INTERNATIONAL PAPER CORPORATION, f/k/a Champion
International Corporation, f/k/a U.S. Plywood Corp. &
Champion Papers, Inc.; OWENS-ILLINOIS, INC.; RAPID AMERICAN
CORPORATION; SELBY, BATTERSBY & CO., now known as SB
Decking, Inc.; UNIROYAL, INC.; WACO INSULATION, INC., now
known as Waco, Inc.; GARLOCK, INC.; GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.;
METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE CO.,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Newport News. Robert J. Krask,
Magistrate Judge. (4:14-cv-00091-RJK)

Submitted: October 6, 2016

Decided: November 21, 2016

Before KING, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Paul A. Weykamp, LAW OFFICES OF PAUL A. WEYKAMP, Hunt Valley, Maryland, for Appellant. Patricia Bugg Turner, Henry N. Ware, Jr., Elizabeth Scott Turner, SPOTTS FAIN PC, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rorie N. Wilson appeals the magistrate judge's orders excluding the testimony of Wilson's expert witness and granting summary judgment in favor of the Appellee. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge. Wilson v. CBS Corp., No. 4:14-cv-00091-RJK (E.D. Va. Nov. 19, 2015). 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