

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
For the Fifth Circuit

No. 93-8005
Summary Calendar

In the Matter of: MARGO NEFF,

Debtor.

MARGO NEFF,

Appellant,

VERSUS

SAN ANTONIO HOUSING AUTHORITY,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Western District of Texas

SA 92 CA 876

(June 28, 1993)

Before POLITZ, Chief Judge, SMITH, and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

After quite a few months of controversy between the parties as to the proper amount of rent which Neff was to pay for the occupancy of an apartment operated by the Housing Authority of San

* 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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

Antonio, the Housing Authority brought suit in the County Court at Law in Bexar County, Texas and secured a jury verdict and a judgment that the Housing Authority was entitled to possession of the premises and that Neff was obligated to pay \$821.50 for rent, late charges, and court costs. Neff appealed this judgment to the Texas State Court of Appeals who affirmed the judgment of the trial court. Neff then filed a Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceeding, and the Housing Authority filed a motion to annul the automatic stay, that the bankruptcy court granted. Neff appealed the bankruptcy court's order to the U. S. District Court, contending that the bankruptcy court failed to give proper effect to 11 U.S.C.A. § 525(a). Concluding that Neff's lease had terminated prior to her bankruptcy petition, the district court affirmed the order of the bankruptcy court terminating the automatic stay. Neff appeals to this Court.

Having carefully considered the briefs, the record excerpts, the reply briefs, and relevant portions of the transcript and record, we have concluded that the findings of the bankruptcy court are not clearly erroneous and the conclusions of law reached by both the bankruptcy court and the district court should be affirmed.

Accordingly, we AFFIRM the judgment of the district court.