

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

Armstrong v. Marks

No. 00-1860 (4th Cir. Sept. 6, 2000) (unpublished) · No. No. 00-1860 · Decided September 6, 2000

SUMMARY

The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit affirmed the district court's denial of Arthur O. Armstrong's motion for leave to file a complaint. The court found no reversible error and adopted the district court's reasoning without oral argument.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per Curiam; Widener; Niemeyer; Williams
JURISDICTION	Federal
DECIDED	September 6, 2000
DOCKET	No. 00-1860
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff appealed the district court's order denying his motion for leave to file a complaint.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The Fourth Circuit reviewed the record and the district court's order for reversible error.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Nonprecedential; unpublished
PARTIES	Arthur O. Armstrong v. Benjamin S. Marks, Jr., H. Terry Hutchens, Connie Inverstine, UC Lending Corporation, Brenda Flinclum

TOPICS

- pleadings
- motion to amend
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court erred in denying Armstrong's motion for leave to file a complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court's denial of Armstrong's motion for leave to file a complaint did not constitute reversible error and was affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“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.” (2)

“Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.” (2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains few substantive facts. Armstrong sought leave to file a complaint in the district court, and the district court denied that motion. The Fourth Circuit concluded that the record and the district court's order disclosed no reversible error.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina denied Armstrong's motion for leave to file a complaint. Armstrong appealed, and the Fourth Circuit affirmed the district court's order on the district court's reasoning.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Armstrong v. Marks, No. MISC-00-45-1 (M.D.N.C. June 12, 2000)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

UNPUBLISHED UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT No. 00-1860 ARTHUR O. ARMSTRONG, Plaintiff - Appellant, versus BENJAMIN S. MARKS, JR.; H. TERRY HUTCHENS; CONNIE INVERSTINE; UC LENDING CORPORATION; BRENDA FLINCLUM, Defendants - Appellees. Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. William L. Osteen, District Judge.

(MISC-00-45-1) Submitted: August 30, 2000 Decided: September 6, 2000 Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and WILLIAMS, Circuit Judges. Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion. Arthur O. Armstrong, Appellant Pro Se. Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c). PER CURIAM: Arthur O. Armstrong appeals the district court’s order denying his motion for leave to file a complaint.

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 *Armstrong v. Marks*, No. MISC-00-45-1 (M.D.N.C. June 12, 2000).

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 2