

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-1118**

---

THE TRAVELERS INDEMNITY COMPANY,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DEEPAK RAJANI; TRAVELLERS.COM, an Internet domain name,

Defendants - Appellants,

DEAR!NET ONLINE E.K.,

Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:10-cv-00448-LO-JFA)

---

Submitted: February 26, 2013

Decided: April 4, 2013

---

Before KING, KEENAN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Deepak Rajani, Appellant Pro Se. Stephanie Hanley Bald, Michael Ryan Justus, FINNEGAN HENDERSON FARABOW GARRETT & DUNNER, LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Deepak Rajani appeals from the district court's final and related orders in this action initiated by The Travelers Indemnity Company ("Travelers"), regarding a website registered to Rajani. Travelers alleged, and the district court agreed, that Rajani's offending website violated the Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act and other laws. See 15 U.S.C. § 1125(d) (2006). By order entered on July 29, 2011, the district court granted Travelers' motion for partial summary judgment and ordered that VeriSign, Inc. change the registrar of the domain name TRAVELLERS.COM to CSC Corporate Domains, Inc., and that CSC Corporate Domains, Inc. register the domain name TRAVELLERS.COM in the name of Travelers. The order noted it would provide its reasoning "in the memorandum opinion to follow." (R. 194). That later memorandum to follow was entered on November 28, 2011, and provided cogent reasoning for its decision to grant partial summary judgment to Travelers. (R. 221). After ruling on the remaining matters in the action, the court dismissed the case in its final order entered on December 1, 2011. (R. 222).

Rajani appeals from the final order alleging that the district court lacked jurisdiction and arguing that the court

erred in granting relief to Travelers.\* We have reviewed the record in this case and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court in its orders. See The Travelers Indem. Co. v. TRAVELLERS.COM, No. 1:10-cv-00448-LO-JFA (E.D. Va. July 29, Nov. 28, and Dec. 1, 2011). We deny the remaining pending motions in this appeal as moot and dispense with oral argument as the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\* Rajani attempts to appeal from numerous other district court orders but all previous appeals and appellate actions, related to the instant district court litigation, were dismissed because the orders were interlocutory, unappealable orders. See The Travelers Indem. Co. v. Rajani, No. 11-1508; Rajani v. The Travelers Indem. Co. No. 11-228; The Travelers Indem. Co. v. Rajani, No. 11-1827.