

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 09-7572**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

SCHULMAN, TREEM, KAMINKOW & GILDEN, P.A.,

Intervenor - Appellee,

WILLIAM C. BOND,

Intervenor - Appellant,

v.

THOMAS L. BROMWELL, SR.; W. DAVID STOFFREGEN; MARY PATRICIA  
BROMWELL,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, District Judge.  
(1:05-cr-00358-JFM)

---

Submitted: March 23, 2010

Decided: May 7, 2010

---

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL,\* and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

---

\* Judge Michael was a member of the original panel but did not participate in this decision. This opinion is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William C. Bond, Appellant Pro Se. Kathleen O'Connell Gavin,  
Michael Joseph Leotta, Assistant United States Attorneys,  
Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William C. Bond appeals the district court's orders denying his motion to intervene and unseal certain documents, and denying reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. Bromwell, No. 1:05-cr-00358-JFM (D. Md. July 16, 2009; July 23, 2009).

We deny Bond's motion for expedited oral argument or for the opinion to be read from the bench, and deny his motion for recusal of the Maryland judges of this court and for the Chief Judge to assign a panel to hear this appeal. We grant the motion of Schulman, Treem, Kaminkow & Gilden, P.A. (STKG) to intervene and file a memorandum in opposition, and deny Bond's emergency motion and renewed motion to strike STKG's pleadings. We grant Bond's motion to allow a reply in excess of page limitations. 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