

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-1709

STEPHEN A. ARMSTRONG,

Party in Interest - Appellant,

and

INTER-WORLD DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION; INTERNA-
TIONAL INVESTIGATIONS, INCORPORATED; RICHARD
L. BAST,

Plaintiffs,

versus

ANTONIA LEIGH PETTIT; BARBARA OZELLA REVES;
WILLIAM G. BILLINGHAM; JOHN F. DAVIS; MARY
AUDREY LARKIN; LOIS AMES; ANTHONY JOSEPH
PETTIT,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

VICTOR MICHAEL GLASBERG; JEANNE GOLDBERG;
COHEN, DUNN & SINCLAIR, PC; J. FREDERICK
SINCLAIR; THOMAS J. CURCIO; CARTER & KRAMER,
PC; CHARLES WARREN KRAMER; JACOBVITZ, ENGLISH
& SMITH, PC; DAVID BENJAMIN SMITH; CLAUDE
DAVID CONVISSER; NANCY GERTNER; PATRICIA
GRIEST; JODY L. NEWMAN; DELMAR D. HARTLEY;
MADDONA LEA SCHAMP PETTIT; ANNE CONNELL;
WILLIAM C. HILLMAN; ROGER A. COX,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Albert V. Bryan, Jr., Senior District Judge. (CA-95-531-A)

Submitted: October 27, 1998

Decided: November 23, 1998

Before WIDENER and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Gottlieb James Frick, II, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellant. Frank Willard Dunham, Jr., COHEN, GETTINGS & DUNHAM, P.C., Arlington, Virginia; Barbara Ozella Reves, Alexandria, Virginia; John Otto Easton, JORDAN, COYNE & SAVITS, Fairfax, Virginia; Pamela Anne Bresnahan, Steven Robert Becker, VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR & PEASE, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Stephen Andrew Armstrong appeals the district court's decisions imposing Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 sanctions and denying his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration.* We have reviewed the record, the district court's opinions, and Armstrong's claims on appeal, and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm the orders on the reasoning of the district court. Armstrong v. Pettit, No. CA-95-531-A (E.D. Va. Dec. 6, 1995; Mar. 24, 1998). 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

* Armstrong's notice of appeal and informal brief state that he is taking appeal from the district court's orders of August 4, October 6, October 10, October 25, November 17, December 5, 20, 1995, January 19, 1996, and March 24, 1998. This court has already determined that Armstrong's prior appeal from the district court's orders of August 4, October 10, October 11 (dated October 6), October 25, and November 20 (dated November 17), was untimely, and that his prior appeal from the district court's orders of December 20, 1995, and January 19, 1996, was without merit. See Armstrong v. Goldberg, No. 96-1223 (4th Cir. Nov. 18, 1997) (unpublished) and this court's order entered February 20, 1998. We decline to reconsider our prior holdings relative to these orders.