

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-6899

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

KEVIN O'NEILL,

Movant - Appellant,

JACK ROSGA; JOSEPH ALLMAN; JOHN BANTHEM, a/k/a Bull; THOMAS BENVIE, a/k/a Taz; WILLIAM DAVEY, a/k/a Rebel; MARK JASON FIEL, a/k/a Jason; MARK STEVEN FIEL, a/k/a Snuff; CHRIS GAGNER; HAROLD HERNDON, a/k/a Lil Dave; MARK LESTER, a/k/a Ivan; BRETT LONGENDYKE; DAVID LOWRY, a/k/a Little David; MICHAEL MARIACA, a/k/a M&M; THOMAS MAYNE, a/k/a Tomcat; HARRY RHYNE MCCALL; BRIAN MCDERMOTT; MICHAEL PEDINI, a/k/a Madman; THOMAS PETRINI, a/k/a Jo-Jo; MICHAEL SMITH; MARK SPRADLING, a/k/a Lytnin; CHRISTOPHER TIMBERS, a/k/a Alibi; JAMIE TOWNSEND, a/k/a Vern; LESLIE WERTH, a/k/a Les; CHARLES LOVE, a/k/a Chuck, a/k/a Rebar; WILLIAM POWELL, a/k/a Torch; CHARLES BARLOW, a/k/a Chuck; DENNIS HALDERMANN, a/k/a Chew Chew,

Defendants,

HARLEY DAVIDSON FINANCIAL SERVICES, INCORPORATED,

Claimant,

KRISTEN LUSK,

Party-in-Interest.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Henry E. Hudson, District Judge. (3:10-cr-00170-HEH)

Submitted: November 7, 2011 Decided: November 18, 2011

Before MOTZ, DUNCAN, and AGEE, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin O'Neill, Appellant Pro Se. Peter Sinclair Duffey, Gurney Wingate Grant, II, Laura Colombell Marshall, Stephen Wiley Miller, Assistant United States Attorneys, Theryn G. Gibbons, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Richmond, Virginia; Dennis Michael Fitzpatrick, Philip Samuel Kaplan, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin O'Neill appeals the district court's order denying his Fed. R. Crim. P. 41(g) motion for return of seized property. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. O'Neill, No. 3:10-cr-00170-HEH (E.D. Va. June 27, 2011). 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