UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1408

BARTON JOSEPH ADAMS; JOSEPHINE ARTILLAGA ADAMS,

Petitioners - Appellants,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 16-1409

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BARTON JOSEPH ADAMS; JOSEPHINE ARTILLAGA ADAMS,

Appellants,

and

$24,764.32,

Defendant.

No. 16-6519

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

BARTON JOSEPH ADAMS,

Defendant - Appellant,

JOSEPHINE ARTILLAGA ADAMS,

Claimant - Appellant.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (3:15-cv-00127-JPB-RWT; 3:09-mj-00024-JPB-JES-1; 3:08-cr-00077-JPB-RWT-1)

Submitted: June 21, 2016 Decided: June 23, 2016

Before DUNCAN, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Barton Joseph Adams, Josephine Artillaga Adams, Appellants Pro Se. William J. Ihlenfeld, II, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Lynette Danae DeMasi-Lemon, Alan McGonigal, Michael D. Stein, Assistant United States Attorneys, Wheeling, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Barton Joseph Adams and Josephine Artillaga Adams appeal the district court's order denying their motion for return of seized property. We affirm.

We review for abuse of discretion the district court's denial of a motion for return of property. United States v. Chambers, 192 F.3d 374, 376 (3d Cir. 1999). We may affirm on any ground appearing in the record. Bryant v. Bell Atl. Md., Inc., 288 F.3d 124, 132 (4th Cir. 2002). The Adams' motion for return of seized property was barred by the statute of limitations because it was not filed within five years of the date of final publication of the notice of seizure. See 18 U.S.C. § 983(e)(1), (3) (2012). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. Adams v. United States, No. 3:15-cv-00127-JPB-RWT (N.D.W. Va. Apr. 6, 2016); United States v. Adams, No. 3:09-mj-00024-JPB-JES-1 (N.D.W. Va. Apr. 6, 2016); United States v. Adams, No. 3:08-cr-00077-JPB-RWT-1 (N.D.W. Va. Apr. 6, 2016). We deny the motion to expedite decision and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED