

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-1966

In Re: JOHN T. COPLEY,

Debtor.

JOHN T. COPLEY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

STATE AUTOMOBILE MUTUAL PROPERTY AND CASUALTY
INSURANCE COMPANY; WANDA COPLEY; UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA; H. LYNDEN GRAHAM, JR.; JANET
SMITH-HOLBROOK, former Chapter 7 Trustee;
DAVID KONRAD, former counsel to Chapter 7
Trustee; JAMES M. PIERSON, former Chapter 13
bankruptcy attorney,

Parties in Interest - Appellees,

and

DEBRA A. WERTMAN; ALFRED SINES, JR., former
divorce attorney; JAMES W. LANE, JR., former
counsel for the debtor; R. SCOTT CLARKE; SHAWN
D. BAYLISS; STEPHEN L. THOMPSON,

Parties in Interest.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of West Virginia, at Huntington. Joseph Robert Goodwin, District Judge. (CA-99-1054-3, BK-97-30131)

Submitted: May 24, 2001

Decided: June 18, 2001

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John T. Copley, Appellant Pro Se. Arden John Curry, II, PAULEY, CURRY, STURGEON & VANDERFORD, Charleston, West Virginia; Gary L. Call, Assistant United States Attorney, Charleston, West Virginia; Lynn B. Pollard, HAMILTON, BURGESS, YOUNG & POLLARD, P.L.L.C., Fayetteville, West Virginia; Janet Smith-Holbrook, David Konrad, HUDDLESTON, BOLEN, BEATTY, PORTER & COPEN, Huntington, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

John T. Copley appeals from the district court's orders affirming numerous orders of the bankruptcy court and denying his motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the lower courts' opinions and orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, while we grant Copley's motion to file a supplemental brief and have considered the issues therein, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Copley v. State Auto. Mut. Prop. & Cas. Ins. Co., Nos. CA-99-1054-3; BK-97-30131 (S.D.W. Va. June 12 & July 6, 2000). In light of the resolution of this appeal, the stay pending appeal entered on October 16, 2000, is terminated. 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