

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 09-1748

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

JOHN J. RACHEL; RGI, INCORPORATED, a Virginia Corporation;
CSM, INCORPORATED, a Maryland Corporation,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 09-2183

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

PRISCILLA RACHEL,

Defendant - Appellant,

and

JOHN J. RACHEL; RGI, INCORPORATED, a Virginia Corporation;
CSM, INCORPORATED, a Maryland Corporation,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District
of Maryland, at Baltimore. William M. Nickerson, Senior
District Judge. (1:02-cv-00754-WMN)

Argued: May 10, 2011

Decided: June 7, 2011

Before WILKINSON and SHEDD, Circuit Judges, and David C. NORTON, Chief United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, sitting by designation.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ARGUED: Edward Jay Tolchin, FETTMANN, TOLCHIN & MAJORS, PC, Fairfax, Virginia, for Appellants. Michael Anthony DiPietro, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee. **ON BRIEF:** Rod J. Rosenstein, United States Attorney, Jamie M. Bennett, Assistant United States Attorney, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

The United States filed this civil action against John Rachel, Priscilla Rachel, RGI, Inc., and CSM, Inc. Pertinent to this appeal, the government asserted five causes of action: Counts 1-3 (False Claims Act violations); Count 7 (Payment Under Mistake of Fact); and Count 8 (Unjust Enrichment). Following trial, the jury returned a verdict on all counts in favor of Priscilla Rachel, and against John Rachel, RGI, Inc., and CSM, Inc. Thereafter, the district court denied various post-trial motions and entered final judgment in accord with the verdict.

On appeal, Priscilla Rachel contends that the district court erred in denying her post-trial motion for attorneys' fees and costs. John Rachel, RGI, Inc., and CSM, Inc. contend that the court erred in denying their post-trial motion for judgment as a matter of law, asserting various grounds. After having the benefit of oral argument and carefully reviewing the briefs, record, and controlling legal authorities, we find no reversible error in the district court's disposition of these issues. Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court. See J.A. 39-53 (memorandum and order denying post-trial motion of John Rachel, RGI, Inc., and CSM, Inc.); J.A. 56-60 (memorandum and order denying post-trial motion of Priscilla Rachel).

AFFIRMED