

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1164

JOHN HENRY HAUPT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS; TOGO WEST, Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs; JAMES MAYE, Director, Regional Office, Department of Veterans Affairs; DIANA WALTON, Assistant Director, Regional Office, Department of Veterans Affairs; STEVE BAST, Resource Management Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs; BILL DIRKER, President, NFFE Union; WILLIAM D. HOGAN, Loan Guaranty Officer; DON DENNEHY, Assistant Loan Guaranty Officer; J. DAVID COOLEY, Chief, Loan Service and Claims; MICHAEL J. SUTER, Senior Loan Specialist; SUSAN AYERS, Loan Specialist; MICHELLE CHOVNEC, Loan Specialist; DONNA MOLLICA, Loan Specialist; CHAIRPERSON OF ADJUSTMENT COMMITTEE, Merit Systems Protection Board; CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, Goodwill Industries, Tinker Mountain, Roanoke, Virginia, General Services Administration Contractor; DORIS FAYE CURRY, Assistant Supervisor, Housekeeping, General Services Administration Contractor, Goodwill Industries, Tinker Mountain; JOYCE FLINT, Housekeeper, General Services Administration Contractor, Goodwill Industries,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior District Judge. (CA-99-518-7)

Submitted: April 13, 2000

Decided: April 20, 2000

Before WIDENER and WILKINS, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Henry Haupt, Appellant Pro Se. John Francis Corcoran, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

John Henry Haupt appeals the district court's order dismissing his civil action. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Haupt v. Department of Veterans Affairs, No. CA-99-518-7 (W.D. Va. Jan. 4, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED