

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-1778**

---

ANGELA G. MCKENZIE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

SETA CORPORATION; MICHAEL C. MONTAVON, P.C.,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 99-1933**

---

ANGELA G. MCKENZIE,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

MICHAEL C. MONTAVON, P.C.,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

SETA CORPORATION,

Defendant.

---

No. 99-1934

---

ANGELA G. MCKENZIE,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SETA CORPORATION,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

MICHAEL C. MONTAVON, P.C.,

Defendant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Chief District Judge. (CA-99-381-A)

---

Submitted: February 16, 2000

Decided: February 24, 2000

---

Before MICHAEL, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Wendu Mekbib, LAW OFFICES OF WENDU MEKBIB, Vienna, Virginia, for Appellant. R. Mark Dare, HAZEL & THOMAS, P.C., Falls Church, Virginia; J. Jonathan Schraub, T. Scott McGraw, SCHRAUB & COMPANY, CHTD., McLean, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In No. 99-1778, Angela G. McKenzie appeals from the district court's order dismissing her civil action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). In Nos. 99-1933 and 99-1934, the Defendants in the underlying action appeal from the district court's order denying relief on their motions for sanctions, Fed. R. Civ. P. 11. Our review of the record and the district court's opinions discloses no reversible error and no abuse of discretion. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See McKenzie v. SETA Corp. No. CA-99-381-A (E.D. Va. May 18, 1999; June 15, 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 orders are marked as "filed" on May 17, 1999, for No. 99-1778, and June 11, 1999 for Nos. 99-1933/1934, the district court's records show that these orders were entered on the docket sheet on May 18, 1999, for No. 99-1778 and June 15, 1999, for Nos. 99-1933/1934. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment or 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).