

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 01-1627**

---

PERNELL WILKINS; SOLLIE WILKINS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

CYNTHIA S. WILKINS,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

MICHAEL D. WILKINS,

Party in Interest,

and

SHERMAN B. LUBMAN,

Trustee.

---

**No. 01-1851**

---

PERNELL WILKINS; SOLLIE WILKINS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

MICHAEL D. WILKINS,

Party in Interest - Appellant,

versus

CYNTHIA S. WILKINS,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

SHERMAN B. LUBMAN,

Trustee - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Robert E. Payne, District Judge. (CA-98-135, BK-95-33189)

---

Submitted: September 25, 2001                      Decided: October 23, 2001

---

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Pernell Wilkins, Sollie Wilkins, Michael D. Wilkins, Appellants Pro Se. Cynthia S. Wilkins, Appellee Pro Se. Neil Orion Reid, Richmond, Virginia; Jeffrey Hamilton Geiger, SANDS, ANDERSON, MARKS & MILLER, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In appeal No. 01-1627, Sollie and Pernell Wilkins appeal from the district court's orders affirming the bankruptcy court's order dismissing their Adversary Proceeding for failure to prosecute and denying their motion for a rehearing. In appeal No. 01-1851, Michael, Sollie, and Pernell Wilkins appeal from the district court's order imposing sanctions and imposing a prefiling injunction. We have reviewed the records in these appeals and the district court's opinion and orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Cynthia Wilkins' motion for appointment of counsel and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Wilkins v. Wilkins, Nos. CA-98-135; BK-95-33189 (E.D. Va. Mar. 23, 2001, Apr. 4, 2001 & May 25, 2001). 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