

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-2020

JOSEPH R. JOHNSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CIRCUIT CITY STORES, INCORPORATED; FIRST NORTH
AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-2021

JOSEPH R. JOHNSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CIRCUIT CITY STORES; CIRCUIT CITY STORES,
INCORPORATED; FIRST NORTH AMERICAN NATIONAL
BANK,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-2022

JOSEPH R. JOHNSON, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

CIRCUIT CITY STORES, INCORPORATED; FIRST NORTH
AMERICAN NATIONAL BANK,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (CA-98-1407-A, CA-99-695-A, CA-99-696-A)

Submitted: November 18, 1999

Decided: November 23, 1999

Before WILKINS, HAMILTON, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joseph R. Johnson, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Amy Miles Kowalski, MCGUIRE, WOODS, BATTLE & BOOTHE, L.L.P., McLean, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Joseph R. Johnson, Jr., appeals the district court's order dismissing with prejudice his civil action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(C). 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 Johnson v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., Nos. CA-98-1407-A; CA-99-695-A; CA-99-696-A (E.D. Va. July 15, 1999).^{*} We deny Appellees' motion to strike Johnson's reply or in the alternative motion for leave to file a surreply. 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 the district court's order is marked as "filed" on July 13, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on July 15, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the 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).