## [DO NOT PUBLISH]

### IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

### FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

|                                       | FILED                 |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| No. 11-14823<br>Non-Argument Calendar | U.S. COURT OF APPEALS |
|                                       | ELEVENTH CIRCUIT      |
|                                       | JULY 6, 2012          |
|                                       | JOHN LEY              |
|                                       | – CLERK               |

D.C. Docket No. 1:10-cv-24347-KMM; 09-BKC-13196-AJC

| In Re: MAURY ROSENBERG, |         |
|-------------------------|---------|
|                         | Debtor. |

DVI RECEIVABLES XIV, LLC, DVI RECEIVABLES XVI, LLC, DVI RECEIVABLES XVII, LLC, DVI RECEIVABLES XVIII, LLC, DVI FUNDING, LLC, ASHLAND FUNDING, LLC, DVI RECEIVABLES XIX, LLC,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

MAURY ROSENBERG,

Defendant-Appellee.

\_\_\_\_\_

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida

\_\_\_\_\_

(July 6, 2012)

Before EDMONDSON, CARNES and HULL, Circuit Judges.

### PER CURIAM:

Plaintiff-Appellants were the petitioning creditors before the bankruptcy court, and they brought an involuntary Chapter 7 bankruptcy petition, as amended, against Maury Rosenberg as debtor. After an evidentiary hearing and exhaustive briefing, the bankruptcy court granted Rosenberg's motion to dismiss the involuntary bankruptcy case, concluding that the Plaintiff-Appellants were not real parties in interest for numerous reasons (including having no financial interest in the case) and thus lacked standing to pursue the asserted claims as petitioning creditors.

In its order filed on September 28, 2011, the district court affirmed the bankruptcy court's dismissal of the involuntary petition with prejudice. Although the district court disagreed with one of the reasons given by the bankruptcy court for the dismissal, the district court agreed with all of the other findings and grounds for dismissal outlined in the bankruptcy court's 34-page order, which the

district court commended as "well-reasoned."

After careful review, we conclude that the Plaintiff-Appellants have not shown reversible error in the district court's September 28, 2011 order. The district court's judgment is affirmed.

# AFFIRMED.