## NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 06a0097n.06 Filed: February 8, 2006

Case No. 04-3611

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

DIANE WILLIAMS; WILLIAM E.	)	
WILLIAMS,	)	
Plaintiffs-Appellants,	)	ON APPEAL FROM THE
Tuments Tippenanes,	)	UNITED STATES DISTRICT
	,	COURT FOR THE NORTHERN
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	DISTRICT OF OHIO
OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE, INC.;	)	
OLD DOMINION FREIGHT LINE, INC.,	)	
FLEXIBLE REIMBURSEMENT PLAN;	)	
FIRST HEALTH BENEFITS	)	
ADMINISTRATORS CORPORATION,	)	
	)	
Defendants-Appellees.		

BEFORE: NORRIS and BATCHELDER, Circuit Judges; COHN\*, District Judge.

ALICE M. BATCHELDER, Circuit Judge. Diane Williams, individually and in her capacity as the guardian of the estate and person of her husband, William E. Williams, brought this action under ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1001, et seq., against the defendants, Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc., Old Dominion Freight Line, Inc. Flexible Reimbursement Plan and First Health Benefits Administrators Corporation, to recover benefits under an employee benefit plan, to redress alleged breaches of fiduciary by the defendants, and to recover statutory penalties and costs. The district court granted the defendants' motion for judgment on the administrative record, holding, in a

<sup>\*</sup>The Honorable Avern Cohn, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, sitting by designation.

lengthy and exhaustive opinion, that the defendants' decision to deny medical benefits to Williams's husband on the basis of a particular coverage exclusion in the plan was not arbitrary and capricious; that Williams is not entitled to relief under either 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(2) or 29 U.S.C. § 1109; that Williams is not entitled to an award of attorney's fees; and that there is no basis upon which Williams could be entitled to statutory damages. Williams appeals each of these conclusions.

After carefully reviewing the record, the applicable law, the parties' briefs, and counsels' arguments, we are convinced that the district court did not err in its conclusions. As the district court's opinion carefully and correctly sets out the law governing the issues raised and clearly articulates the reasons underlying its decision, issuance of a full opinion by this court would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the district court's opinion, we **AFFIRM** the judgment of the district court.