



2010 Decisions

Opinions of the United
States Court of Appeals
for the Third Circuit

1-11-2010

Dale Michael v. Elba McIntosh

Precedential or Non-Precedential: Non-Precedential

Docket No. 08-3698

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2010

Recommended Citation

"Dale Michael v. Elba McIntosh" (2010). *2010 Decisions*. 2086.

http://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2010/2086

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2010 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. For more information, please contact Benjamin.Carlson@law.villanova.edu.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

08-3698

DALE R. MICHAEL,
Appellant

v.

ELBA MCINTOSH; BETSY M. GOODWILL

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of the Virgin Islands
(Civ. No. 3-07-cv-00100)
District Judge: Hon. Lawrence F. Stengel

Submitted Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 34.1(a)
December 4, 2009

Before: McKee, Fuentes and Nygaard, *Circuit Judges*

(Opinion filed :January 11, 2010)

OPINION

MCKEE, *Circuit Judge*

Dale R. Michael appeals the district court's grant of summary judgment in favor of the defendants in this action alleging that the defendants defrauded him out of an interest in real estate. For the reasons that follow, we will affirm.

Inasmuch as we are writing primarily for the parties who are familiar with the rather contentious background of this suit, we need not set forth the procedural or factual history. We have reviewed the record and the briefs of the parties as well as the district court's very thorough and thoughtful Memorandum dated July 31, 2008. In that Memorandum, Judge Stengel carefully explains that there is no genuine issue of material fact and that the defendants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law. We can add little to Judge Stengel's explanation, and we will therefore affirm substantially for the reasons set forth in his July 31, 2008 Memorandum.