

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 08-1599

FIDELITY AND GUARANTY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, a Maryland corporation; SETTLEMENT FUNDING, LLC, d/b/a Peachtree Settlement Funding,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

RAPID SETTLEMENTS, LTD.,

Defendant - Appellant,

FIDELITY AND GUARANTY ASSIGNMENT CORPORATION,

Claimant - Appellee,

and

LUCILLE HARROD; BROOKE SCHUMM, III,

Defendants.

No. 08-2303

FIDELITY AND GUARANTY LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, a Maryland corporation; SETTLEMENT FUNDING, LLC, d/b/a Peachtree Settlement Funding,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

RAPID SETTLEMENTS, LTD.,

Defendant - Appellant,

FIDELITY AND GUARANTY ASSIGNMENT CORPORATION,

Claimant - Appellee,

and

LUCILLE HARROD; BROOKE SCHUMM, III,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Catherine C. Blake, District Judge. (1:05-cv-02732-CCB)

Submitted: July 20, 2009

Decided: October 23, 2009

Before MICHAEL, GREGORY, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stewart A. Feldman, THE FELDMAN LAW FIRM, L.L.P., Houston, Texas, for Appellant. Elyse L. Strickland, SELZER, GURVITCH, RABIN & OBECNY, CHTD., Bethesda, Maryland; H. Mark Stichel, GOHN, HANKEY & STICHEL, L.L.P., Baltimore, Maryland; Stephen H. Kaufman, OFFIT KURMAN, P.A., Owings Mills, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Rapid Settlements, Ltd., appeals from the district court's orders enjoining an arbitration proceeding filed by Rapid Settlements, granting summary judgment against Rapid Settlements in this interpleader action, imposing sanctions against Rapid Settlements and its counsel, and denying reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the briefs filed by the parties and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Rapid Settlements, Ltd. v. Settlement Funding, LLC, No. 1:05-cv-02732-CCB (D. Md. Mar. 6, 2007, Sept. 27, 2007, Apr. 15, 2008, and filed Oct. 15, 2008; entered Oct. 16, 2008). 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