

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 17-1009

Dr. John Gray

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Welch Motor Company, Inc., doing business as Welch-Nissan Motors, Inc.; David
Welch, Owner

Defendants - Appellees

No. 17-1227

Dr. John Gray

Plaintiff - Appellant

v.

Welch Motor Company, Inc., doing business as Welch-Nissan Motors, Inc.; David
Welch, Owner

Defendants - Appellees

Appeals from United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Arkansas - Pine Bluff

Submitted: August 7, 2017
Filed: August 10, 2017
[Unpublished]

Before WOLLMAN, BEAM, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Welch Motor Company hired Dr. John Gray as a salesperson in July 2014. Less than one month later, Welch Motor's sales manager terminated Gray's employment in part because Gray would frequently leave work to attend to personal errands. Gray sued Welch Motor, raising claims under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1126(h), (i) and 1117), the Arkansas Deceptive Trade Practices Act (ADTPA) (Ark. Code § 4-88-101 et seq.), and the Arkansas Civil Rights Act (Ark. Code § 16-123-107), alleging various acts of race-based discrimination and unfair trade practices.

The district court¹ denied various of Gray's discovery motions and requests, and ultimately granted summary judgment in favor of Welch Motor on all of Gray's claims. We have carefully reviewed all of Gray's appellate arguments, the pleadings, and record evidence in this matter. Cognizant of the standards of review and reviewing the facts in the light most favorable to Gray, giving him the benefit of all reasonable inferences, Edwards v. Hiland Roberts Dairy, Co., 860 F.3d 1121, 1125 (8th Cir. 2017) (grant of summary judgment reviewed de novo); Hudson Enters, Inc. v. Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's London Ins. Cos., 855 F.3d 874, 877 (8th Cir. 2017) ("We review a district court's 'discovery rulings in a manner both narrow and deferential, and reversal is only warranted if an erroneous ruling amounted to a gross

¹The Honorable James M. Moody, Jr., United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

abuse of discretion.'" (quoting Robinson v. Potter, 453 F.3d 990, 994-95 (8th Cir. 2006))), we affirm the district court for the reasons stated in its analyses and orders. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.
