IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

_____

No. 93-3054
_____

DAVID LEON DUGGER, M.D.,

                                        Plaintiff-Appellant,

                        versus

UPLEDGER INSTITUTE, ET AL.,

                                        Defendants-Appellees.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Louisiana
(CA 90 0828 I (3))
_____
(October 18, 1993)

Before SNEED,[*] REYNALDO G. GARZA, and JOLLY, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:[**]

        Dr. Dugger filed this action against Dr. Upledger, the

Upledger Institute, and its liability insurer for negligent

misrepresentation. Dr. Dugger claimed economic loss and pain and

suffering, which he alleged stemmed from an investigation by the

_____

        [*]Senior Circuit Judge of the Ninth Circuit, sitting by
designation.

        [**]Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions
that have no precedential value and merely decide particular
cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes
needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal
profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the court has determined
that this opinion should not be published.

Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners, which investigation resulted from the misrepresentations made by the Upledger Institute. The district court granted the defendants' motions for summary judgment on three grounds: (1) Dr. Dugger's injuries resulting from the investigation were not "advertising injuries" or "personal injuries" covered by the insurance policy; (2) Dr. Dugger failed to file the suit within the one-year prescriptive period from February 17, 1989, when he had notice of the tortious act, the resulting damage, and the causal connection between the two; and (3) Dr. Dugger's injuries were not caused by the Upledger Institute seminar because the Board of Medical Examiners initiated the investigation of his advocacy of the cranial treatment before he attended the seminar.

After review of the briefs and the record, and after hearing arguments by counsel, we find no reversible error, and accordingly the district court's grant of summary judgment to the defendants is

A F F I R M E D.