

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-1513**

---

MICHAEL A. SCOTT,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

NORFOLK SOUTHERN CORPORATION,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

D. R. GOODE, individually and in his official capacity with Northern Southern Corporation; S. C. TOBIAS, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; J. L. MANETTA, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; D. W. MAYBERRY, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; W. E. HONEYCUTT, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; L. D. HALE, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; T. A. HEILIG, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; C. D. VITTUR, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; D. D. GRAAB, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; A. L. LUTTRELL, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; J. R. GRAY, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; W.

F. HENLEY, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; J. E. PAIR, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation; J. W. CLEMMER, individually and in his official capacity with Norfolk Southern Corporation,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Henry C. Morgan, Jr., District Judge. (CA-96-257-2)

---

Submitted: August 24, 1999

Decided: October 26, 1999

---

Before WIDENER, WILLIAMS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael A. Scott, Appellant Pro Se. Samuel Johnson Webster, Heather Ann Mullen, WILLIAMS, KELLY & GREER, Norfolk, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Michael A. Scott appeals the district court's judgment granting summary judgment to the Appellee and dismissing his claim that the Appellee retaliated against him by proposing a job transfer to another location which was subsequently rescinded. We have reviewed the record and the district court's order and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Scott v. Norfolk Southern Corp., No. CA-96-257-2 (E.D. Va. Mar. 17, 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 the district court's judgment is marked as "filed" on March 16, 1999, the district court's records show that it was entered on the docket sheet on March 17, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment 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).