

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-1078

ORAN T. DAVIS; REGINA DAVIS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

DAVIS PRESS REPAIR, INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff,

versus

TIMOTHY E. MEREDITH; ROBERT W. WARFIELD; PAULA
J. DARRAH; MARK F. GABLER; WARFIELD, MEREDITH
& DARRAH, a Professional Corporation of
Attorneys at Law; GEOFFREY S. TOBIAS; MELISSA
A. LENGYEL; OBER, KALER, GRIMES & SHRIVER;
FIELD CONTAINER COMPANY, L.P.; FIELD CONTAINER
MANAGEMENT COMPANY, L.P.; FIELD HOLDINGS,
INCORPORATED,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Chief
District Judge. (CA-01-452-MU)

Submitted: May 16, 2002

Decided: May 22, 2002

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Oran T. Davis, Regina Davis, Appellants Pro Se. David Betts Hamilton, David Glennon Redding, HAMILTON, GASKINS, FAY & MOON, P.L.L.C., Charlotte, North Carolina; Stephanie Hutchins Autry, Robert W. Sumner, Gloria T. Becker, CRANFILL, SUMNER & HARTZOG, L.L.P., Raleigh, North Carolina; Wesley Thaddeus Adams, III, Stephen S. Ashley, Jr., W. THAD ADAMS, III, P.A., Charlotte, North Carolina; Kristen Joy Achterhof, Karl Richard Barnickol, IV, KATTEN, MUCHIN & ZAVIS, Chicago, Illinois; John Scott Evans, ADAMS, SCHWARTZ & EVANS, P.A., Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Oran T. Davis and Regina Davis appeal the district court's order granting three separate motions to dismiss filed by the Defendants and dismissing their civil action for lack of jurisdiction. 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 Davis v. Meredith, No. CA-01-452-MU (W.D.N.C. filed Dec. 13, 2001; entered Dec. 19, 2001). We deny as moot the Davises' motion to remand the case, or in the alternative, to place the case in abeyance pending disposition of their Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion in the district court. 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