

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-2115**

---

MISSIONS TO MILITARY ACCOUNT NO. 1 AND ACCOUNT NO. 2; SAFE HARBOR CHRISTIAN FOUNDATION; CCR DATA SYSTEMS, INC.; KEITH DAVEY,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

ALBERT YALE; NORMAN REGISTER; VALERIE REGISTER; MARILYN YALE; MARY LYNN VAN HORN; MARCIA CANADAY; JIMMY CANADAY; PAULA CANADAY; EDWARD ESTES, III; EDWARD ESTES, IV; CLAGGETT AND SONS, INC.; P3T, LTD.; THADDEUS CLAGGETT; EMILY CLAGGETT; ERIC LEHNER; DAVID ABEL; JUDY ABEL; JOHN MCFERREN, JR.; ALICE MCFERREN; HENRY TURNER; TOM PRINSEN; GERALD WEBBER; ROGER PETERSON; TIMOTHY VALENTINE; ROXANNE WYMER,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COMMUNITYONE BANK, N.A.,

Defendant - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., District Judge. (3:15-cv-00403-RJC-DSC)

---

Submitted: January 28, 2020

Decided: February 11, 2020

---

Before AGEE and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Sebastian Rucci, LAW OFFICES OF SEBASTIAN RUCCI, Youngstown, Ohio, for Appellants. Bradley R. Kutrow, T. Richmond McPherson, III, MCGUIREWOODS LLP, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Missions to Military Account No. 1 and Account No. 2, Safe Harbor Christian Foundation, CCR Data Systems, Inc., and Keith Davey (collectively, “Appellants”) appeal the district court’s order granting summary judgment to Defendant CommunityOne Bank, N.A., on Appellants’ claims that CommunityOne Bank violated North Carolina’s Uniform Fiduciaries Act, N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 32-1 to 13 (2019). Appellants also contend that the court erred in denying leave to file a second amended complaint. We have reviewed the parties’ briefs and the joint appendix and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Yale v. CommunityOne Bank, N.A.*, No. 3:15-cv-00403-RJC-DSC (W.D.N.C. Aug. 20, 2018). We 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*