

Filed: August 19, 1996

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 95-2685  
(CA-95-366, BK-93-11389C-7W-B)

---

Wilbur P. Hollar, et al,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

William Steven Myers, et al,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

O R D E R

---

The Court amends its opinion filed April 4, 1996, as follows:

On page 2, line 8 of the opinion -- "(M.D.N.C. Sept. 5, 1995)"  
is corrected to read "(M.D.N.C. Aug. 23, 1995)."

For the Court - By Direction

/s/ Bert M. Montague

---

Clerk

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-2685**

---

In Re: WILBUR P. HOLLAR; In Re: RUTH CAROL  
HOLLAR,

Debtors.

---

WILBUR P. HOLLAR; RUTH CAROL HOLLAR,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

WILLIAM STEVEN MYERS; LINDA WEST MYERS,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle Dis-  
trict of North Carolina, at Greensboro. N. Carlton Tilley, District  
Judge. (CA-95-366, BK-93-11389C-7W-B)

---

Submitted: March 21, 1996

Decided: April 4, 1996

---

Before NIEMEYER and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Wilbur P. Hollar, Ruth Carol Hollar, Appellants Pro Se. Leslie  
Gray Frye, Sr., FRYE & BOOTH, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for  
Appellees.

---

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellants appeal from the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order dismissing their adversary action for failure to comply with discovery and alternatively granting Defendants' motion for summary judgment. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny Appellants' motion for summary reversal and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Hollar v. Myers, Nos. CA-95-366; BK-93-11389C-7W-B (M.D.N.C. Aug. 23, 1995). Additionally, we deny Appellants' motion to strike Appellees' informal brief. 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