

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2530

CALVIN SHOEMAKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY; HUGHES ELECTRONICS
CORPORATION; RAYTHEON COMPANY,

Defendants.

No. 99-1255

CALVIN SHOEMAKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY; HUGHES ELECTRONICS
CORPORATION; RAYTHEON COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Defendant.

No. 99-1256

CALVIN SHOEMAKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

HUGHES AIRCRAFT COMPANY; HUGHES ELECTRONICS
CORPORATION; RAYTHEON COMPANY,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Senior
District Judge. (CA-97-2010-A)

Submitted: May 13, 1999

Decided: May 19, 1999

Before WIDENER and MOTZ, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER,* Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Calvin Shoemaker, Appellant Pro Se. Brian David Miller, Assistant United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia; Francis Eugene Purcell, Jr., Lora A. Brzezynski, MCKENNA & CUNEO, Washington, D.C.; Thomas Michael Abbott, Philip B. Kumpis, MCKENNA & CUNEO, Los Angeles, California, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

* Senior Judge Butzner did not participate in consideration of this case. The opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

PER CURIAM:

Calvin Shoemaker appeals the district court's orders dismissing this qui tam civil action filed pursuant to the False Claims Act. See 31 U.S.C. § 3730(b) (1994). Shoemaker also appeals the district court's order declining to reconsider the dismissal of his claims against the United States Army. 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 Shoemaker v. Hughes Aircraft Co., No. CA-97-2010-A (E.D. Va. Sept. 4, Oct. 2, 1998, & Feb. 1, 1999). 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