

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2324

LLOYD A. BJORLO; SHARON J. BJORLO,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

ZENOVIA QUALLIOTINE, Individually and as
Trustee under a certain revocable trust,
unrecorded and identified as "The Zenovia J.
Qualliotine Revocable Trust",

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Jerome B. Friedman, District
Judge. (CA-03-567-2)

Submitted: April 27, 2005

Decided: June 30, 2005

Before MICHAEL and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Daniel Hartnett, AYRES & HARTNETT, Accomac, Virginia, for
Appellants. Robert W. McFarland, MCGUIRE WOODS, LLP, Norfolk,
Virginia, Robert L. Hodges, Amy M. Pocklington, MCGUIRE WOODS, LLP,
Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellants Lloyd A. Bjorlo and Sharon J. Bjorlo appeal the district court's judgment denying their claims for specific performance and damages. After a bench trial, this court reviews the district court's conclusions of law de novo and its findings of facts for clear error. Minyard Enter., Inc. v. Southeastern Chem. & Solvent Co., 184 F.3d 373, 380 (4th Cir. 1999); Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a). A finding of fact is clearly erroneous when, "although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." United States v. United States Gypsum Co., 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948); In re Green, 934 F.2d 568, 570 (4th Cir. 1991).

We have reviewed the parties' opening briefs, Appellants' reply brief, and the joint appendix and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Bjorlo v. Qualliotine, No. CA-03-567-2 (E.D. Va. Sept. 28, 2004). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED