

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 94-30606

SILVER STAR ENTERPRISES, INC., ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

SILVER STAR ENTERPRISES, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

SCHEEVPAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V., former owner of the
M.V. SARACCA, Her Engines, Tackle, Apparel, Etc., in rem,

Defendant-Appellant.

* * * * *

WORLD SHIP SUPPLY, INC., ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V., in personam,

Defendant.

* * * * *

BOLAND MARINE AND MANUFACTURING COMPANY, INC.

Plaintiff,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V., in personam,

Defendant.

* * * * *

RONICK SHIPPING B V,

Plaintiff,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V., in personam,

Defendant.

TURLAK SHIPPING COMPANY, INC., d/b/a MAR-TEX SHIPPING &
CHARTERING AGENCY,
Plaintiff,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V., a/k/a SURINAM
NAVIGATION CO., LTD.,
Defendant.

* * * * *
TRANS OCEAN LTD.,
Plaintiff,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V.,
Defendant.

* * * * *
E N BISSO & SON, INC.,
Plaintiff,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAME, N.V., ET AL.,
Defendants.

* * * * *
GALEHEAD, INC.,
Plaintiff,

versus

SARAMACCA MV, HER ENGINES, TACKLE, APPAREL, ETC.,
Defendant.

* * * * *
TOURO INFIRMARY,
Plaintiff,

versus

SCHEEPVAART MAATSCHAPPIJ SURINAM, N.V., IN PERSONAM,
Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Louisiana
(92-CV-1297-D, 92-CV-2802, 92-CV-3077, 92-CV-3093,
92-CV-4195, 93-CV-135, 93-CV-136 & 93-CV-330)

(May 12, 1995)

Before DAVIS, SMITH, and WIENER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

We have reviewed the briefs and pertinent portions of the record and have heard the arguments of counsel. The tender was inadequate, and there was no abuse of discretion in the district court's failure to reconsider its summary judgment ruling. We perceive no reversible error in the other actions of the district court.

It is time to put this lengthy litigation to an end. The judgments and orders appealed from are AFFIRMED.

* Local Rule 47.5.1 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 Pursuant to that rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.