

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1740

MANUELA HOLMES, f/k/a Manuela Moore,
Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MORGAN H. MOORE,
Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Columbia. Terry L. Wooten, Chief District
Judge. (3:13-cv-01254-TLW)

Submitted: January 29, 2015 Decided: February 12, 2015

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Brian C. Gambrell, HAMILTON & ASSOCIATES, LLC, Columbia, South
Carolina, for Appellant. Stephanie R. Fajardo, THE FAJARDO LAW
FIRM, LLC, Irmo, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Manuela Holmes appeals from the district court's order dismissing her action for breach of contract and promissory estoppel against her former husband, Morgan H. Moore. The district court premised its dismissal on lack of subject matter jurisdiction, applying the domestic relations exception to diversity jurisdiction. Holmes contends that her claims are not barred by the domestic relations exception because, she claims, the property settlement agreement that she seeks to enforce does not involve issues related to the divorce decree; the settlement agreement is a contract on its own terms subject to contract law of South Carolina; and the court erred in failing to grant her summary judgment (although she did not move for summary judgment) because there were no remaining issues of fact.

We review legal questions, including the breadth of a district court's jurisdiction, de novo. Simmons v. United Mortg. & Loan Inv., LLC, 634 F.3d 754, 762 (4th Cir. 2011). We have reviewed the record and the parties' briefs and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Holmes v. Moore, No. 3:13-cv-01254-TLW (D.S.C. June 23, 2014).

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