

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 94-10911
(Summary Calendar)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

11.8 ACRES OF LAND, all appurtenances,
and improvements thereon, located at
Route 2, Box 259-AA, Canton, Van Zandt
County, Texas, ET AL.,

Defendants,

MILTON EUGENE ROBINS,

Claimant-Appellant.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

AMERICAN EAGLE GOLD COIN SET
(4 coins), ET AL.,

Defendants,

MILTON EUGENE ROBINS,

Claimant-Appellant.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ACRES OF LAND, 296.84 acres of
land in Hunt county, Texas,
and all appurtenances and
improvements thereon, ET AL.,

Defendants,

MILTON EUGENE ROBINS,

Claimant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
(3:90-CV-1251-G c/w 3:91-CV-434-G & 3:91-CV-770-G)

(June 9, 1995)

Before DUHÉ, WIENER and STEWART, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Milton Robins's direct appeal was dismissed on May 25, 1993, for want of prosecution for failure to file a timely brief. He now appeals the denial of his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion to set aside forfeiture judgment. The motion was filed on May 20, 1994, more

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 Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

than 15 months after the district court's final judgment of forfeiture was entered. The district court gave no explanation for denying Robins's motion in its order, but neither did it advert to any issues of substance sought to be raised in Robins's motion. We are comfortable in inferring that the court's denial was grounded principally if not entirely in the inordinate delay^{SO}exceeding 15 months^{SO}in filing the motion. And our comfort level is enhanced by the knowledge that our standard of review of the district court's ruling is abuse of discretion.

AFFIRMED.