UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-2180

CX REINSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED, formerly known as CNA Reinsurance Company Limited,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BRAYON J. LOYAL,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

STEWART J. LEVITAS,

Defendant.

No. 16-2228

CX REINSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED, formerly known as CNA Reinsurance Company Limited,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRAYON J. LOYAL,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

STEWART J. LEVITAS,

Defendant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. James K. Bredar, District Judge. (1:15-cv-02174-JKB)

Submitted: May 31, 2017

Decided: June 6, 2017

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

No. 16-2180 affirmed; No. 16-2228 dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Amato, IV, GOODMAN, MEAGHER & ENOCH, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant/Cross-Appellee. Stuart M.G. Seraina, Louis P. Malick, KRAMON & GRAHAM, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee/Cross-Appellant.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Brayon J. Loyal appeals the district court's order denying her motion for summary judgment and granting summary judgment in favor of CX Reinsurance Company Ltd. ("CX Reinsurance"). CX Reinsurance cross-appeals from the same order by the district court denying its motion to dismiss the action.

With respect to Loyal's appeal, we have reviewed the parties' briefs and the record and, although we grant Loyal's motion to file the additional materials submitted with her opening brief, we find no reversible error in the portion of the district court's order granting summary judgment to CX Reinsurance. Accordingly, for the reasons stated by the district court, we affirm the district court's order granting summary judgment. *Loyal v. CX Reinsurance Co.*, No. 1:15-cv-02174-JKB (D. Md. Sept. 15, 2016). Because we affirm the district court's grant of summary judgment in CX Reinsurance's favor, we dismiss as moot CX Reinsurance's cross-appeal of the denial of its motion to dismiss. 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.

> No. 16-2180 *AFFIRMED* No. 16-2228 *DISMISSED*