

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2635

JEAN J. AIDONIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

F. BRUCE BACH, Honorable; SKADDEN, ARPS,
SLATE, MEACHER & FLOM, P.C., by and through
Robert Lighthizer and Jessie M. Brooks; COHEN,
GETTINGS, DUNHAM AND DAVIS, PC, by and through
its associate David Masterman; JESSIE M.
BROOKS, Suggestion of Bankruptcy; MYRON TELUK;
DUFF & LEFFLER, PC, by and through its presi-
dent David Duff; DAVID MASTERMAN, Individually;
DAVID DUFF, Individually; PAUL VANGELLOW,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern Dis-
trict of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief District
Judge. (CA-97-1407-A)

Submitted: April 6, 1999

Decided: September 3, 1999

Before WIDENER, WILKINS, and NIEMEYER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jean J. Aidonis, Appellant Pro Se. William Mark Dunn, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia; Edward Joseph Meehan, SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM, L.L.P., Washington, D.C.; John Edward Gagliano, COHEN, GETTINGS & DUNHAM, Arlington, Virginia; Paul Warren Mengel, III, RICHARDS, MCGETTIGAN, REILLY & WEST, Alexandria, Virginia; Myron Teluk, Fairfax, Virginia; John Elphinstone McIntosh, Jr., CREWS & HANCOCK, Fairfax, Virginia; David Drake Hudgins, HUDGINS LAW FIRM, Alexandria, Virginia; Paul Vangellow, Falls Church, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

The district court granted a motion finally dismissing Aidonis' action on January 9, 1998. Aidonis requested reconsideration which the court denied on January 23, 1998. On that same day, Aidonis filed a handwritten pleading entitled "Request for a Ruling Prior to Further Proceedings Joinder." On September 29, 1998, the district court denied the request for a ruling, stating that "the case has been dismissed." Aidonis filed a timely appeal from the district court's September 29 order. We affirm.

While the "Request for a Ruling, etc." was somewhat incoherent, the court had already filed opinions in the case explaining its action in dismissing the case, and the case was finally dismissed on January 9, 1998. No appeal from that order was taken. The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying the "Request for a Ruling, etc."

We also deny Aidonis' "Motion for Judgment or in the Alternative for Sanctions" filed in this court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contention are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED