

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 00-20573  
Summary Calendar

---

In The Matter Of: JORGE A. LENTINO, M.D.;  
EDUARDO P. LENTINO, M.D.,

Debtors,

MARTA A. LENTINO; JORGE A. LENTINO, M.D.;  
EDUARDO P. LENTINO, M.D.,

Appellants,

versus

LOWELL T. CAGE, Trustee,

Appellee.

---

In The Matter Of: JORGE A. LENTINO;  
EDUARDO P. LENTINO, M.D., also known as Eduardo Pedro Lentino,  
also known as E. P. LENTINO,

Debtors,

LOWELL T. CAGE, Trustee,

Appellee,

versus

MARTA A. LENTINO; JORGE A. LENTINO, M.D.; EDUARDO P. LENTINO,  
M.D.,

Appellants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Southern District of Texas  
(H-97-CV-498)

---

January 9, 2001

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, WIENER, and BARKSDALE, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

Eduardo P., Jorge A., and Marta A. Lentino appeal a Preclusion Order enjoining them from filing, without the district court's prior written permission, papers that relate to the bankruptcies of Eduardo and Jorge Lentino.

Upon review of the record, we conclude that the order was warranted. See *Ferguson v. MBank Houston, N.A.*, 808 F.2d 358, 359-60 (5th Cir. 1986). Further, we reject as meritless Appellants' contention that the district court did not give them proper notice of its intent to enjoin them. The order was requested at a hearing on 25 April 2000, which Appellants attended. Finding that such order was warranted, the district court informed Appellants of its intent to enter it. The order was signed one month later, thus, affording Appellants a fair opportunity to oppose it.

We also reject Appellants' contention, assuming it was preserved in district court, that the district court judge exhibited bias and prejudice toward them. Appellants misunderstood the district judge's remarks. A reasonable person would not, as a

---

\*Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

result of these remarks, harbor doubts about the district judge's impartiality. See *United States v. Jordan*, 49 F.3d 152, 155 (5th Cir. 1995).

***AFFIRMED***