

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 00-2029

---

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF  
THE FIRST CHURCH OF CHRIST, SCIENTIST; THE  
CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLISHING SOCIETY,

Plaintiff - Appellees,

versus

DAVID E. ROBINSON,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

DAVID J. NOLAN; UNIVERSITY OF CHRISTIAN SCI-  
ENCE; THE ROAN MOUNTAIN INSTITUTE OF CHRISTIAN  
SCIENCE AND HEALTH,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western Dis-  
trict of North Carolina, at Asheville. Lacy H. Thornburg, District  
Judge. (CA-99-148-1)

---

Submitted: December 14, 2000

Decided: January 9, 2001

---

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

David E. Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. Joseph H. Lessem, COWAN,  
LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C., New York, New York, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

David E. Robinson appeals from the district court's orders granting the Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, issuing a permanent injunction, dismissing as frivolous a number of Robinson's motions, and denying Robinson's motion for reconsideration in this trademark infringement case. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Christian Science Bd. v. Robinson, No. CA-99-148-1 (W.D.N.C. July 11 & July 24, 2000).<sup>\*</sup> 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

---

<sup>\*</sup> Although the district court's orders are marked as "filed" on July 6, 2000, and July 21, 2000, respectively, the district court's records show that they were entered on the docket sheet on July 11, 2000, and July 24, 2000, respectively. 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).