

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION
File Name: 16a0480n.06

No. 15-4011

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

KENNETH C. WRIGHT, III,

)

Plaintiff-Appellant,

)

v.

)

NILES EXPANDED METALS, et al.,

)

Defendants-Appellees.

)

)

FILED

Aug 17, 2016

DEBORAH S. HUNT, Clerk

ON APPEAL FROM THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
OHIO

BEFORE: SILER, BATCHELDER, and GIBBONS, Circuit Judges.

ALICE M. BATCHELDER, Circuit Judge. Kenneth Wright alleges that Niles Expanded Metals, J.R. Phillips, Jr., and Ian Thompson (collectively “NEM”) violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 253, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a), and Ohio Revised Code § 4112.02 by firing him after he advocated for the hiring by NEM of his African American friend and qualified African Americans generally. The parties consented to have a United States magistrate judge conduct any and all further proceedings, including the entry of a final judgment. [R. 11, at PageID 87]. The magistrate judge issued a thorough memorandum opinion and order granting NEM’s motion to strike Wright’s affidavit and its motion for summary judgment. [R. 83, at PageID 2202-15]. Wright argues on appeal that a genuine issue of material fact exists regarding NEM’s motive for firing him such that the magistrate judge should not have granted NEM’s motion for summary judgment, and the magistrate judge erred

No. 15-4011, Wright v. Niles Expanded Metals, et al.

by striking his affidavit, which he submitted in his response to NEM's motion for summary judgment. [R. 71-1, at PageID 1836-38].

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