

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-2307**

---

In re: GARY ALLEN WASHINGTON; MICHELLE ANNE WASHINGTON,

Debtors,

-----

GARY ALLEN WASHINGTON; MICHELLE ANNE WASHINGTON,

Debtors - Appellants,

v.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY BANK; FEDERAL NATIONAL  
MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION,

Creditors - Appellees,

US TRUSTEE,

Trustee - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:16-cv-00128-CMC)

---

Submitted: July 20, 2017

Decided: July 24, 2017

---

Before DUNCAN and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Alexander B. Wathen, Houston, Texas, for Appellants. Ramona D. Elliott, Deputy Director/General Counsel, P. Matthew Sutko, Associate General Counsel, Wendy Cox, Trial Attorney, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.; Judy A. Robbins, United States Trustee, John Timothy Stack, Assistant United States Trustee, Linda Barr, Trial Attorney, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Columbia, South Carolina; Carmen V. Ganjehsani, RICHARDSON, PLOWDEN & ROBINSON, PA, Columbia, South Carolina; Travis Emil Menk, BROCK & SCOTT, PLLC, Charlotte, North Carolina for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gary Allen Washington and Michelle Anne Washington appeal from the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's orders denying their second motion for reconsideration of the order granting relief from the automatic stay, denying their request for an extension of time to amend and confirm their plan of reorganization, and dismissing their Chapter 11 bankruptcy case. We have reviewed the record provided on appeal and the arguments of the parties, and we find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Washington v. South Carolina Comm. Bank*, No. 3:16-cv-00128-CMC (D.S.C. Oct. 11, 2016). 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*