

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 98-2182**

---

MARYANN LAREMONT-LOPEZ,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SOUTHEASTERN TIDEWATER OPPORTUNITY PROJECT,

Defendant - Appellee,

SUANNE LEIGH HARDEE; THOMAS F. HENNESSY,

Movants.

---

**No. 98-2217**

---

MARYANN LAREMONT-LOPEZ,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SOUTHEASTERN TIDEWATER OPPORTUNITY PROJECT,

Defendant - Appellant,

SUANNE LEIGH HARDEE; THOMAS F. HENNESSY,

Movants.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Raymond A. Jackson, District Judge. (CA-96-1202-2)

---

Submitted: January 21, 1999

Decided: February 3, 1999

---

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Maryann Laremont-Lopez, Appellant Pro Se. James A. Gorry, III, John Hume Taylor, Jr., TAYLOR & WALKER, P.C., Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Maryann Laremont-Lopez appeals the district court's order denying her motion for rehearing or modification of decision. Cross-Appellant Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project appeals a portion of the same district court order denying the award of attorney's fees. 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 Laremont-Lopez v. Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project, No. CA-96-1202-2 (E.D. Va. July 8, 1998).<sup>\*</sup> We deny Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project's motion to dismiss the appeal in 98-2182. 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 order is marked "filed" on July 7, 1998, the court's docket discloses that it was entered on the docket sheet on July 8, 1998. We accept that date as the effective date of the district court's decision pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58 and 79(a). See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).