

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-1163**

---

ALLEN V. JAFFE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LISA SPICKLER GOODWIN, Attorney; JOHN R. WALK,  
Attorney; HIRSCHLER, FLEISCHER, WEINBERG, COX  
AND ALLEN, P.C., a professional corporation;  
VIRGINIA PHOTOTHERAPY, L.L.C.; RONALD MARK  
LANDESS, Doctor, DPM; CATHERINE HAMMOND,  
Judge,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District  
Judge. (CA-03-799)

---

Submitted: June 30, 2004

Decided: July 15, 2004

---

Before MOTZ, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Allen V. Jaffe, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Emery Draim, David Drake  
Hudgins, HUDGINS LAW FIRM, Alexandria, Virginia; Charles Frederick  
Witthoefft, HIRSCHLER, FLEISCHER, Richmond, Virginia; James Walter

Hopper, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond,  
Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Allen V. Jaffe appeals the district court's orders denying his motion for extension of time to file responsive pleadings and dismissing his complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Jaffe v. Goodwin, No. CA-03-799 (E.D. Va. Nov. 7, 2003; Jan. 7, 2004). Although we decline to impose sanctions on Jaffe for pursuing this appeal at this time, we caution that further frivolous or malicious filings before this court or in the district court could result in sanctions. We express no opinion as to the motion for sanctions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 pending in the district court. Accordingly, we deny all Appellees' motions for sanctions. We further grant Appellees' motions to strike "Appellant's Answer to Appellees' Reply Brief in Support of Rule 38 Motion for Sanctions." 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