



2003 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

2-12-2003

Hidy v. TIAA Grp Long Term

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Non-Precedential

Docket 02-2140

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2003

Recommended Citation

"Hidy v. TIAA Grp Long Term" (2003). *2003 Decisions*. 807.
http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2003/807

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2003 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No: 02-2140

CAROLYN B. HIDY,

Appellant

v.

TIAA GROUP LONG TERM DISABILITY BENEFITS INSURANCE POLICY,
an employee benefit plan; TEACHERS INSURANCE AND ANNUITY
ASSOCIATION, Claims Administrator of LTD Plan; BUCKMAN AND
VAN BUREN, Plan Administrator of LTD Plan

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Delaware
(C.A. No. 01-450)
District Court: Hon. Sue L. Robinson

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
February 11, 2003

Before: ALITO and McKEE, Circuit Judges,
and SCHWARZER, Senior District Judge*

(Filed February 12, 2003)

OPINION

McKEE, Circuit Judge.

Carolyn Hidy appeals from the district court's decision that her action under the

*Honorable William W. Schwarzer, Senior District Judge, Northern District of California sitting by designation.

Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA), ' 502(a)(1)(B), 29 U.S.C. ' 1132(a)(1)(B), in which she alleged that she was improperly denied long term disability benefits, was time-barred in light of our holding in *Syed v. Hercules Inc.*, 214 F.3d 155 (3d Cir. 2000).

Inasmuch as we write only for the parties, it is not necessary to recite the factual or procedural background of this case. Moreover, in its Memorandum Opinion, the district court carefully and completely explained its reasons for finding that Hidy's claim is time-barred. *Hidy v. TIAA Group Long Term Disability Benefits Ins. Policy*, 2002 WL 450984 (D.Del. March 19, 2002). We can add nothing to the district court's thoughtful analysis, and we will not attempt to gild the lily by engaging in a redundant discussion simply to reach the same result.

Accordingly, we will affirm the district court substantially for the reasons set forth in the district court's opinion without further elaboration.

/s/ Theodore A. McKee
Circuit Judge