

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1752**

---

MARY LOU BUTTON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

KEVIN K. CHUMNEY; JANET L. CHUMNEY, husband and wife;  
CHESAPEAKE APPALACHIA, LLC,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WILLIAM H. GASTON; DIANE MARKET GASTON, husband and wife,

Defendants.

---

**No. 14-1777**

---

MARY LOU BUTTON,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CHESAPEAKE APPALACHIA, LLC,

Defendant - Appellant,

KEVIN K. CHUMNEY; JANET L. CHUMNEY, husband and wife,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

WILLIAM H. GASTON; DIANE MARKET GASTON, husband and wife,  
Defendants.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern  
District of West Virginia, at Clarksburg. Irene M. Keeley,  
District Judge. (1:13-cv-00232-IMK-JSK)

---

Submitted: September 29, 2015 Decided: October 19, 2015

---

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

No. 14-1752 affirmed; No. 14-1777 dismissed by unpublished per  
curiam opinion.

---

George B. Armistead, BAKER & ARMISTEAD, PLLC, Morgantown, West  
Virginia, for Appellant/Cross-Appellee Mary Lou Button. John B.  
Brooks, LAW OFFICE OF JOHN B. BROOKS, PLLC, Morgantown, West  
Virginia, for Appellees Kevin K. Chumney and Janet L. Chumney.  
W. Henry Lawrence, IV, Amy Marie Smith, Lauren Alise Williams,  
STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC, Bridgeport, West Virginia, for  
Appellee/Cross-Appellant Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Mary Lou Button appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC ("Chesapeake"), but denying Chesapeake's cross-claim, in Button's civil action regarding the tax foreclosure sale of her property. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Button v. Chumney, No. 1:13-cv-00232-IMK-JSK (N.D. W. Va. June 27, 2014). Because we affirm the district court's grant of summary judgment, we dismiss as moot Chesapeake's cross-appeal of the same order. 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.

No. 14-1752 AFFIRMED  
No. 14-1777 DISMISSED