

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-1988**

---

In Re: BEVERLY BYRD; RALPH T. BYRD,

Debtors.

- - - - -

BEVERLY BYRD; RALPH T. BYRD,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

JAMES M. HOFFMAN,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

GREGORY P. JOHNSON,

Trustee.

---

**No. 08-1989**

---

In Re: BEVERLY BYRD; RALPH T. BYRD,

Debtors.

- - - - -

BEVERLY BYRD; RALPH T. BYRD,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

JAMES M. HOFFMAN,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

GREGORY P. JOHNSON,

Trustee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District Judge. (8:07-cv-02960-AW; 8:07-cv-03049-AW)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2009

Decided: November 19, 2009

---

Before WILKINSON, MICHAEL, and KING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ralph T. Byrd, Laytonsville, Maryland, for Appellants. Stephen A. Metz, John D. Sadler, SHULMAN, ROGERS, GANDAL, PORDY & ECKER, P.A., Potomac, Maryland; James M. Hoffman, OFFIT KURMAN, Bethesda, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Beverly and Ralph Byrd appeal from the district court's orders affirming the bankruptcy court's orders finding them in contempt and imposing sanctions against them for (1) failing to timely to produce documents and information as ordered by the bankruptcy court and (2) willfully violating the automatic stay and the Barton Doctrine,\* and the injunction order issued by the bankruptcy court. We have reviewed the record on appeal and the briefs filed by the parties and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Byrd v. Hoffman, Nos. 8:07-cv-02960-AW; 8:07-cv-03049-AW (D. Md., July 31, 2008; filed July 30; entered July 31, 2008). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

\* Barton v. Barbour, 104 U.S. 126, 127 (1881) (requiring that, "before suit is brought against a receiver, leave of the court by which he was appointed must be obtained").