

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1857

CHRISTOPHER PETITO; STEPHEN C. SIEBER; RONALD WILLIAMS,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

THE WASHINGTON POST COMPANIES; WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP;
ANGIE'S LIST; JEANNE CROUSE; LEANDER BARNHILL; CHERYL ROSE;
JAMES HOFFMAN; OFFIT/KIRMAN; KEITH HAVENS; CLARKSON MCDOW;
ICE MILLER, LLP; BRACEWELL AND GIULIANI, LLP; PAUL POGUE;
THOMAS MEADOWS; JOHN KELLY; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA; ROBERT
HARRIS; JOHN POOLE; TODD JOHANNSEN; MONICA HAMMOCK,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Roger W. Titus, District Judge. (8:11-
cv-01314-RWT)

Submitted: February 16, 2012

Decided: February 21, 2012

Before SHEDD, KEENAN, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Petito; Stephen Charles Sieber; Ronald Williams,
Appellants Pro Se. Kevin Hardy, Lynda Schuler, WILLIAMS &
CONNOLLY, LLP, Washington, D.C.; George A. Gasper, Michael A.
Wukmer, ICE MILLER, LLP, Indianapolis, Indiana; Shelby J.
Kelley, BRACEWELL & GIULIANI, LLP, Washington, D.C.; Neil R.

White, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenbelt, Maryland;
James Martin Hoffman, OFFIT KURMAN, PA, Bethesda, Maryland;
James C. McKay, Jr., OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Washington, D.C.; Charles Cate, HANNON LAW
GROUP, LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellees; Keith Ryan Havens,
John Poole, Monica Hammock, Appellees Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Petito, Stephen Sieber, and Ronald Williams appeal from the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order dismissing their complaint. We have reviewed the record on appeal and the informal briefs filed by the parties and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Petito v. The Washington Post Companies, No. 8:11-cv-01314-RWT (D. Md., July 8, 2011). We deny the motion to recuse the lower court judges and deny the motion to consolidate this appeal with Appeal No. 11-2208. 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