

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1889

MONA NAITHRAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

REGAL WARE, INCORPORATED,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-00-979-PJM)

Submitted: December 14, 2000

Decided: December 21, 2000

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

William N. Rogers, Rockville, Maryland, for Appellant. Robert L. Ferguson, Jr., Michele Z. Blumenfeld, FERGUSON, SCHETELICH & HEFFERNAN, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mona Naithram appeals from the district court's order dismissing her civil complaint for failure to properly effect service of process. Our review of the record, the parties' briefs, and the district court's opinion discloses no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Naithram v. Regal Ware, Inc., No. CA-00-979-PJM (D. Md. June 1, 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

^{*} Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on May 30, 2000, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on June 1, 2000. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).