## **United States Court of Appeals FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

|                             | No. 10-1 | 1349                          |
|-----------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|
| Steven M. Maus,             | *        |                               |
| Appellant,                  | *        |                               |
|                             | *        | Appeal from the United States |
| v.                          | *        | District Court for the        |
|                             | *        | District of Minnesota.        |
| Brian N. Toder and          | *        |                               |
| Chestnut & Cambronne, P.A., | *        | [UNPUBLISHED]                 |
| ,                           | *        |                               |
| Appellees.                  | *        |                               |
|                             |          |                               |

Submitted: October 18, 2010 Filed: October 25, 2010

\_\_\_\_\_

Before RILEY, Chief Judge, BYE and MELLOY, Circuit Judges.

\_\_\_\_\_

## PER CURIAM.

Steven M. Maus appeals the district court's<sup>1</sup> grant of summary judgment in favor of Brian N. Toder and Chestnut & Cambronne, P.A. We affirm.

The dispute giving rise to this action is an attorney's lien for unpaid attorney fees in the amount of \$81,778.93 held by the appellees on Maus's partnership dissolution trust account. After a state court entered judgment for the lien and the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The Honorable Patrick A. Conmy, United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota, sitting in the District of Minnesota.

Minnesota Court of Appeals affirmed the judgment, <u>Maus v. Galic</u>, No. A06-1183, 2007 WL 1248160, at \*2 (Minn. Ct. App. May 1, 2007), Maus brought this action in federal court seeking an accounting; he also stated claims for usury, breach of fiduciary duty, and an alleged violation of the Truth in Lending Act (TILA), 15 U.S.C. §§ 1601-1667f. The district court concluded the claim for an accounting was barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel because of determinations made in the Minnesota state court proceedings; the district court further concluded the claims for usury, breach of fiduciary duty, and the alleged TILA violation either failed on the merits or were time-barred. <u>Maus v. Toder</u>, 681 F. Supp. 2d 1007, 1013-19 (D. Minn. 2010).

Having carefully reviewed the record de novo, as well as the parties' briefs, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court in its thorough and well-reasoned decision. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

\_\_\_\_\_