

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2293

MARK P. HESSEK; ARTHUR E. DEANGELIS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

NORTH AMERICAN MORTGAGE INSURANCE SERVICES;
NORTH AMERICAN COMPANY FOR LIFE AND HEALTH
INSURANCE, and related companies; DIME SAVINGS
BANK OF NEW YORK, FSB, and all its related
insurance and mortgage services; NORTH
AMERICAN MORTGAGE COMPANY,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

MARTIN SCOTT, President, Insurance Agent and
Broker; RICHARD MIRRO, President and CEO;
MELVIN CEBRIK, Senior Vice President; GARY
ANDRASKO, CLU, Vice President; LAWRENCE TOAL,
President, CEO and Chairman; MICHAEL ENG, Vice
President, Corporate Attorney; JOHN C. WATSON,
Chairman and CEO; MICHAEL MASTERSON, President
NACOLAH; ALL SUCCESSORS AND ASSIGNS; FRED
MILLER, Manager, Phoenix Office, NAMIS;
CHRISTOPHER MORGA, Assistant Manager, Phoenix
Office, NAMIS; BEN ROLFES, Manager, Life
Division, Virginia Beach NAMIS Office; DIME
INSURANCE GROUP,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Henry Coke Morgan, Jr., District
Judge. (CA-02-985)

Submitted: March 29, 2004

Decided: April 20, 2004

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Mark P. Hessek, Arthur E. DeAngelis, Appellants Pro Se. James Phillip Naughton, Sara Lynne Berg, HUNTON & WILLIAMS, Norfolk, Virginia; Bryan David Bolton, Michael Patrick Cunningham, FUNK & BOLTON, P.A., Baltimore, Maryland; Eric Wagner Schwartz, TROUTMAN SANDERS, L.L.P., Virginia Beach, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Mark P. Hessek and Arthur E. DeAngelis appeal the district court's order denying relief under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for failure to state a RICO claim under 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-68 (2000). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Hessek v. North American Mortgage Ins. Servs., No. CA-02-985 (E.D. Va. Oct. 17, 2003). 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