# IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 95-20215

ARKWRIGHT-BOSTON MANUFACTURERS; MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY; MUTUAL MARINE OFFICE, INC.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

### versus

JAMES E. ROSS, ET AL.,

Defendants,

JAMES E. ROSS and LLOYDS OF LONDON (reinsurers),

Defendants-Appellees.

versus

J. DOUGLAS SUTTER,

Defendant-Appellant,

versus

MAFRIGE & KORMANIK, P.C.; STEVENS MAFRIGE; RONALD J. KORMANIK, G. BYRON SIMS; THOMAS A. BROWN, BROWN SIMS WISE & WHITE, P.C.; THOMAS N. THURLOW, and CHARLES R. LIPCON,

Appellees.

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

TRACEY NAVIGATION CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

### versus

JAMES E. ROSS; THE OCEANUS MUTUAL UNDERWRITING ASSOCIATION (BERMUDA); ALEXANDER & ALEXANDER OF TEXAS, INC.

Defendants,

JAMES E. ROSS,

Defendant-Appellee,

and

J. DOUGLAS SUTTER,

Defendant-Appellant.

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_

ARKWRIGHT-BOSTON MANUFACTURERS; MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY; MUTUAL MARINE OFFICE, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

#### versus

TRACEY NAVIGATION CO., LTD.; GONZALO SOSA, Individually and Assignee of Tracey Navigation Company, Intervenor;

Defendants-Third Party Plaintiffs-Appellees,

and

GONZALO SOSA, Individually and Assignee of Tracey Navigation Company,

Intervenor-Appellee,

versus

J. DOUGLAS SUTTER,

Third Party Defendant-Appellant,

versus

JAMES E. ROSS,

Third Party Defendant-Appellee. Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas

## June 11, 1996

Before GARWOOD, DAVIS and DeMOSS, Circuit Judges.\*

PER CURIAM:

After consideration of the briefs and record, this Court concludes that appellant has failed to demonstrate any reversible error, or that the district court clearly erred or abused its discretion in declining to impose sanctions under Rule 11 or section 1927. Accordingly, the judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED. The motion of appellees for sanctions under Rule 38 is DENIED.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>\*</sup>Pursuant to Local Rule 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in Local Rule 47.5.4.