

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1288

MICHAEL MADDEN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

MCDONALD'S CORPORATION; MIGUEL ROVIRA; GERMAN
VELASQUEZ,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Peter J. Messitte, District Judge. (CA-
97-3386-PJM)

Submitted: June 17, 1999

Decided: June 22, 1999

Before MURNAGHAN and TRAXLER,* Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Madden, Appellant Pro Se. Bruce Stephen Harrison, Kelly S.
Jennings, SHAW & ROSENTHAL, Baltimore, Maryland; David Anthony
Castro, BIERER & SHAR, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

* Judge Traxler 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) (1994).

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael Madden appeals the district court's orders denying his motions to reopen the civil action in which Madden pursued claims under 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2 (1994) (Title VII). 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 Madden v. McDonald's Corp., No. CA-97-3386-PJM (D. Md. Feb. 12 and Feb. 24, 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

^{*} Although three of the district court's orders are marked as "filed" on February 3, 1999, and one order is marked as "filed" on February 17, 1999, the district court's records show that the three orders were entered on the docket sheet on February 12, 1999, and the fourth order was entered on February 24, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment or order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).