**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 08-2304**

---

M.M., widow of N.M.,

Petitioner,

v.

UNIVERSAL MARITIME APM TERMINALS; SIGNAL MUTUAL INDEMNITY ASSOCIATION; DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION PROGRAMS,

Respondents.

---

**No. 08-2312**

---

UNIVERSAL MARITIME APM TERMINALS; SIGNAL MUTUAL INDEMNITY ASSOCIATION,

Petitioners,

v.

M.M., widow of N.M.,

Respondent.

---

On Petitions for Review of an Order of the Benefits Review Board. (BRB-08-0213; BRB-08-0213A; BRB-08-0212; BRB-08-0212A)

---

Submitted: October 27, 2009 Decided: November 30, 2009

---

Before KING, SHEDD, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

---

Petitions denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bruce Bennett Eisenstein, EISENSTEIN LAW OFFICES, Baltimore, Maryland, for M.M., widow of N.M. Lawrence Philip Postol, SEYFARTH & SHAW, Washington, D.C., for Universal Maritime APM Terminals and Signal Mutual Indemnity Association; Kathleen Hwang Kim, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, Washington, D.C., for DOWCP.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

M.M., widow of N.M., seeks review of the Benefits Review Board's decision and order affirming the administrative law judge's denial of longshore disability benefits pursuant to 33 U.S.C. §§ 901-950 (2006). Universal Maritime APM Terminals seeks review of the administrative law judge's denial of its request to submit additional evidence on remand. Our review of the record discloses that the Board's decision is based upon substantial evidence and is without reversible error. Accordingly, we deny the petitions for review for the reasons stated by the Board. M.M. v. Universal Maritime APM Terminals, Nos. BRB-08-0213; BRB-08-0213A; and Universal Maritime APM Terminals v. M.M., Nos. BRB-08-0212; BRB-08-0212A (Sept. 30, 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.

PETITIONS DENIED