

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-1463

LANCER INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

and

VIP LIMOUSINE SERVICES, LTD.; GLEN M. LEE, d/b/a VIP
Limousine, Ltd.; LEE JAMES CRAWFORD,

Defendants - Appellees,

v.

DAVID SNYDER and MARY SNYDER, Personal Representatives of
the estate of Michael C. Snyder,

Defendants - Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern
District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. Gina M. Groh,
District Judge. (3:11-cv-00111-GMG)

Submitted: August 2, 2013

Decided: December 5, 2013

Before TRAXLER, Chief Judge, DUNCAN, Circuit Judge, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

F. Samuel Byrer, Peter A. Pentony, LAW OFFICE OF F. SAMUEL
BYRER, PLLC, Charles Town, West Virginia, for Appellants.
Michael E. Lang, MARGOLIS EDELSTEIN, Beaver, Pennsylvania, for

Appellee Lancer Insurance Company. Daniel R. Schuda, Karen E. Klein, SCHUDA & ASSOCIATES, PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellees VIP Limousine Services, Ltd., and Glen M. Lee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Lancer Insurance Company ("Lancer") brought this declaratory judgment action against VIP Limousine Service, Ltd.; Glen M. Lee d/b/a VIP Limousine, Ltd.; and David and Mary Snyder ("the Snyders") as personal representatives of the estate of their deceased son Michael C. Snyder ("Michael"). In its action, Lancer sought a determination that it was not required to indemnify Lee Crawford for liability arising out of an accident that occurred when a vehicle Crawford was driving struck and killed Michael. The Snyders filed a counterclaim seeking to collect on a state-court judgment they had previously obtained against Crawford based on his negligence in causing the accident. The district court granted summary judgment against the Snyders and in favor of Lancer and the other parties. See Lancer Ins. Co. v. VIP Limousine Serv., Ltd., No. 3:11-CV-111, 2013 WL 937735 (N.D. W. Va. Mar. 11, 2013).

The Snyders now appeal. We have reviewed the record and have found no error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See id. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED