

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-2044

In Re: PETER PAUL MITRANO,

Debtor.

PETER PAUL MITRANO,

Debtor - Appellant,

v.

RJM ACQUISITIONS LLC; ECAST SETTLEMENT CORPORATION; PRA
RECEIVABLES MANAGEMENT, LLC; FAIRFAX COUNTY; ASSET
ACCEPTANCE LLC; AMERICAN EXPRESS CENTURION BANK; DENOVS
CORPORATION LTD; VIRGINIA KELLY,

Creditors - Appellees,

and

ROBERT OGDEN TYLER; W. CLARKSON MCDOW, JR.,

Trustees - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema,
District Judge. (1:12-cv-00122-LMB-IDD; 11-14531-RGM)

Submitted: October 15, 2012

Decided: October 18, 2012

Before MOTZ, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Peter Paul Mitrano, Appellant Pro Se. Nancy F. Loftus, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax, Virginia; Linda D. Regenhardt, BAILEYGARY, PC, Vienna, Virginia; Derek K. Prosser, TYLER, BARTL, RAMSDELL & COUNTS, PLC, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Peter Paul Mitrano appeals the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order dismissing without prejudice his objections to proofs of claim filed by numerous creditors in his bankruptcy case. The district court also rejected Mitrano's challenge to the transfer of venue from the Southern District of West Virginia to the Eastern District of Virginia, and warned Mitrano that further frivolous appeals to that court, including reargument of his challenge to the venue transfer order, will be subject to sanctions. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Mitrano v. RJM Acquisitions LLC, No. 1:12-cv-00122-LMB-IDD (E.D. Va. July 24, 2012). We decline to address Mitrano's challenge to the validity of his conviction entered in the District Court for the District of New Hampshire. We deny Mitrano's motions to expedite and for a stay pending appeal. 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