

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-1818

LOUIS E. WARREN, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

MAIN INDUSTRIES, INC., a Virginia corporation,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Newport News. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (4:16-cv-00181-RAJ-DEM)

Submitted: April 18, 2019

Decided: May 9, 2019

Before KING and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William R. Poynter, KALEO LEGAL, Virginia Beach, Virginia; David J. Sullivan,
REAVES COLEY, PLLC, Chesapeake, Virginia, for Appellant. Steven B. Wiley,
WILEY LAW OFFICES, PLLC, Norfolk, Virginia; Todd M. Gaynor, GAYNOR LAW
CENTER, P.C., Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Main Industries, Inc. (Main) appeals the district court's order denying its posttrial motions, which Main filed after a jury returned a verdict in favor of Louis E. Warren, Jr., on Warren's race discrimination claim, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (West 2012 & Supp. 2018).^{*} We review de novo the district court's order to the extent the court denied Main's Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(b) motion for judgment as a matter of law, but apply the deferential abuse of discretion standard of review to the district court's order to the extent the court denied Main's Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(a) motion for a new trial. *See Russell v. Absolute Collection Servs., Inc.*, 763 F.3d 385, 391 (4th Cir. 2014) (motion for judgment as a matter of law); *Gregg v. Ham*, 678 F.3d 333, 342 (4th Cir. 2012) (motion for a new trial). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *See Warren v. Main Indus., Inc.*, No. 4:16-cv-00181-RAJ-DEM (E.D. Va. June 19, 2018). 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

^{*} Warren's complaint also contained a Virginia common law claim for wrongful discharge in violation of public policy, which was disposed of when the district court granted Main's motion to dismiss that claim. Warren does not challenge the district court's dismissal of the wrongful discharge claim on appeal.