

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 12a0706n.06

Case No. 10-6455

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED
Jul 03, 2012
LEONARD GREEN, Clerk

RICHARD A. THOMPSON,)

Plaintiff-Appellant,)

v.)

UGL UNICCO, UNICCO SERVICE)
COMPANY, d/b/a UGL Unicco,)

Defendants-Appellees.)

ON APPEAL FROM THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT
COURT FOR THE WESTERN
DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

BEFORE: BATCHELDER, Chief Circuit Judge; NORRIS and STRANCH, Circuit Judges.

ALICE M. BATCHELDER, Chief Judge. Appellant Richard A. Thompson is a diabetic who worked for Appellee UGL Unicco. After UGL fired him in 2008, Thompson sued UGL for, among other things, disability discrimination under the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* (“ADA”), and the Tennessee Disability Act, Tenn. Code Ann. § 8-50-103 (“TDA”). At the close of discovery, UGL moved for summary judgment. Finding that Thompson had failed to show that he was “disabled” under the ADA or the TDA, the district court granted UGL’s motion. Thompson appealed, arguing that, with the facts construed in his favor, he had produced sufficient evidence to create a jury question over whether he was disabled.

After carefully reviewing the district court’s opinion, the briefs, and the record in this case, we conclude that the district court did not err in granting summary judgment to UGL. As the district court correctly set out the applicable law and correctly applied that law to the undisputed material

No. 10-6455, *Thompson v. UGL Unicco, et al.*

facts contained in the record, issuance of a full written opinion by the court would serve no jurisprudential purpose.

Accordingly, on the grounds stated in the district court's well-reasoned opinion, we **AFFIRM** the judgment of the district court.