

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-2131

LINDA L. KENNEDY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RICHARD-FLAGSHIP SERVICES, INCORPORATED; DEAN CLIFTON, individually, and as manager, agent, partner, shareholder or director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated; DAN CLARK, individually, and as manager, agent, vice president, partner, shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services Incorporated; STAN SISSON, individually, and as manager, agent, Human Resources Director, partner, shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and F.A. Richard & Associates, Incorporated; FRANCIS A. RICHARD, individually, and as manager, agent, partner, shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and F.A. Richard & Associates, Incorporated; F.A. RICHARD & ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED, a Louisiana corporation, doing business in Virginia, and as an agent, partner, owner, shareholder and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated; STEVE JOHNSON, individually, and as agent, president, chief executive officer, partner, shareholder and/or director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and The Flagship Group, Limited; ROBERT O'SULLIVAN, individually, and as agent, vice president, partner, shareholder/and or director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and The Flagship Group, Limited; THE

FLAGSHIP GROUP, LIMITED, a corporation doing business in Virginia, and as agent, partner, owner, shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 00-2300

LINDA L. KENNEDY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

RICHARD-FLAGSHIP SERVICES, INCORPORATED; DEAN CLIFTON, individually, and as manager, agent, partner, shareholder or director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated; DAN CLARK, individually, and as manager, agent, vice president, partner, shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services Incorporated; STAN SISSON, individually, and as manager, agent, Human Resources Director, partner, shareholder and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and F.A. Richard & Associates, Incorporated; F A RICHARD & ASSOCIATES, INCORPORATED, a Louisiana corporation, doing business in Virginia, and as an agent, partner, owner, shareholder and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated; STEVE JOHNSON, individually, and as agent, president, chief executive officer, partner, shareholder and/or director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and The Flagship Group, Limited; ROBERT O'SULLIVAN, individually, and as agent, vice president, partner, shareholder/and or director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and The Flagship Group, Limited; THE FLAGSHIP GROUP, LIMITED, a corporation doing business in Virginia, and as agent, partner, owner,

shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated; FRANCIS A. RICHARD, individually, and as manager, agent, partner, shareholder, and director of Richard-Flagship Services, Incorporated, and F.A. Richard & Associates, Incorporated,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senior District Judge. (CA-98-602-2)

Submitted: January 11, 2001

Decided: January 23, 2001

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Linda L. Kennedy, Appellant Pro Se. Robert L. O'Donnell, Arlene F. Klinedinst, Christopher Ambrosio, VANDEVENTER BLACK, L.L.P., Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellees.

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

PER CURIAM:

Linda L. Kennedy seeks to appeal the district court's orders, ordering costs against her, denying Defendants' motion for attorneys' fees, and denying her motion to proceed on appeal in forma pauperis.* We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Kennedy v. Richard Flagship Servs., Inc., No. CA-98-602-2 (E.D. Va. July 25, Aug. 25, & Sept. 20, 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. We also deny Kennedy's pending motion to proceed in forma pauperis.

AFFIRMED

* Because Kennedy's brief on appeal is unclear, we have liberally construed her appeal to object to all three of the district court's orders.