

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 91-2820

KAY KO MACHINE COMPANY, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

HCC INDUSTRIES,

Defendant-Appellant,

MARK SOKOLOW,

Intervenor-Appellant and
Third Party Plaintiff-Intervenor,

versus

MARK FAUBION

Third Party Defendant-Intervenor,
Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
For the Southern District of Texas

(CA H 85 2263)

(December 31, 1992)

Before GOLDBERG, JOLLY and WIENER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

In the principal action before us on appeal, Defendant-Appellant HCC Industries complains that the district court erred first in holding that it has personal jurisdiction over HCC in this matter and second in piercing the corporate veil in the application of the corporate doctrine of alter ego to find HCC responsible for the judgment debt of its wholly-owned subsidiary, Cadillac Machines, Inc. Secondly, Third Party Intervenor-Appellant and Plaintiff-Intervenor, Mark Sokolow, Attorney at Law, complains that the district court erred in dismissing his claim for a portion of the attorneys' fees awarded by that court in favor of Kay Ko and its attorney, Third Party Defendant-Intervenor/Appellee, Mark Faubion.

We have carefully reviewed all pertinent parts of the record in this fact-driven case, and given due consideration to the briefs and arguments of counsel, but we have found, on the particular facts before us, no reversible error. Therefore, the judgments of the district court are

AFFIRMED.

*Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the Court has determined that this opinion should not be published.