

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2165

MICHAEL ANDREW JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

VERISIGN, INCORPORATED; NETWORK SOLUTIONS,
INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

DOUGLAS L. WOLFORD, Acting President, Mass
Market, as an individual and in his corporate
capacity; BENJAMIN R. TURNER, Vice President,
as an individual and in his corporate
capacity; JEFFREY W. JOHNSON, Vice President,
as an individual and in his corporate
capacity; ROBERT SMITH, Assistant General
Manager, as an individual and in his corporate
capacity,

Defendants.

JOHN M. ALBRIGHT,

Movant.

No. 03-2340

MICHAEL ANDREW JOHNSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

VERISIGN, INCORPORATED; NETWORK SOLUTIONS,
INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

DOUGLAS L. WOLFORD, Acting President, Mass
Market, as an individual and in his corporate
capacity; BENJAMIN R. TURNER, Vice President,
as an individual and in his corporate
capacity; JEFFREY W. JOHNSON, Vice President,
as an individual and in his corporate
capacity; ROBERT SMITH, Assistant General
Manager, as an individual and in his corporate
capacity,

Defendants.

JOHN M. ALBRIGHT,

Movant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District
Judge. (CA-01-765-A)

Submitted: September 22, 2004

Decided: October 29, 2004

Before LUTTIG, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

No. 03-2165 affirmed; No. 03-2340 dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael Andrew Johnson, Appellant Pro Se. Larry Robert Seegull, PIPER RUDNICK, LLP, Baltimore, Maryland; Charles B. Wayne, PIPER RUDNICK, LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael Andrew Johnson appeals from the district court's order denying his motion for judgment as a matter of law in the jury's finding that his employer did not discharge Johnson in retaliation for protected activity (No. 03-2165). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Johnson v. Verisign, Inc., No. CA-01-765-A (E.D. Va. Aug. 18, 2003). We further dismiss Johnson's "protective cross-appeal" (No. 03-2340) for lack of jurisdiction. 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.

No. 03-2165 AFFIRMED
No. 03-2340 DISMISSED