

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

THOMAS W. SCOTT,

Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

No. 99-2085

ADT SECURITY SYSTEMS,

INCORPORATED,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.  
Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge.  
(CA-99-572-A)

Submitted: December 22, 1999

Decided: February 28, 2000

Before NIEMEYER and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges,  
and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed in part and remanded in part by unpublished per curiam  
opinion.

---

**COUNSEL**

Thomas W. Scott, Appellant Pro Se. Daniel Warren Whitney, Sr.,  
Kathleen Dick Leslie, WHITNEY & BOGRIS, Towson, Maryland,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

---

## OPINION

### PER CURIAM:

Thomas W. Scott appeals from the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his complaint against ADT Security Systems, Inc., in which he asserted a claim for breach of contract. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Scott v. ADT Security Sys., Inc., No. CA-99-572-A (E.D. Va. July 30, 1999). Scott also challenges the district court's ruling that his motion for Rule 111 sanctions would be moot in light of the dismissal of the action. The district court's ruling effectively barred Scott from filing the motion. A federal court may consider collateral issues, such as a Rule 11 motion, after the entry of a final order. See Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp., 496 U.S. 384, 396 (1990). Therefore, the district court's dismissal of the case would not moot the motion for sanctions. Accordingly, we affirm the dismissal of the action but remand to the district court to allow Scott to file his motion for sanctions.<sup>2</sup> 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 IN PART AND REMANDED IN PART

---

<sup>1</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. 11.

<sup>2</sup> We express no opinion as to whether sanctions are warranted.