

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1459**

---

BRANCH BANKING AND TRUST COMPANY,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

CATHY G. LANIER; RANDY D. LANIER,

Defendants - Appellants,

and

TECHNOLOGY SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., District Judge. (3:13-cv-01318-JFA)

---

Submitted: October 22, 2014

Decided: October 29, 2014

---

Before KING, SHEDD, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Cathy G. Lanier; Randy D. Lanier, Appellants Pro Se. Steven Barry Licata, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Randy and Cathy Lanier (collectively, "the Laniers") appeal the district court's judgment in favor of Branch Banking & Trust Company ("BB&T Co.") and its order denying their Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion for reconsideration. We affirm.

First, the Laniers challenge the district court's jurisdiction over BB&T Co.'s action. We conclude that the district court correctly found complete diversity among the parties and, therefore, had jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) (2012). See United States ex rel. Vuyyuru v. Jadhav, 555 F.3d 337, 348 (4th Cir. 2009) (stating standard of review); Hoschar v. Appalachian Power Co., 739 F.3d 163, 170-71 (4th Cir. 2014) (discussing diversity jurisdiction with regard to corporations). Next, the Laniers suggest that the district court judge displayed bias towards them, but the record does not support their claim. See Belue v. Leventhal, 640 F.3d 567, 573 (4th Cir. 2011) (providing standard).

Finally, after a careful review of the record, we hold that the district court properly rejected the Laniers' various attempts to show that the promissory note and the mortgages obligating them to BB&T Co. were invalid or unenforceable and to challenge the amount of damages awarded by the district court.

Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of the district court and its order denying reconsideration. 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