

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 98-2246

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a North Carolina Body
Politic,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

GEORGE E. BURDICK; MARY K. BURDICK,

Defendants - Appellants.

No. 98-2247

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a North Carolina Body
Politic,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

GEORGE E. BURDICK; MARY K. BURDICK,

Defendants - Appellants,

and

BEN N. WILLIAMSON, III, Trustee; FARM CREDIT
BANK OF COLUMBIA, Lienholder,

Defendants.

No. 98-2248

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a North Carolina Body
Politic,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

GEORGE E. BURDICK; MARY K. BURDICK,

Defendants - Appellants,

and

JOHN TANTUM, Trustee: Nationscredit Financial
Services Corporation of America, Lienholder,

Defendant.

No. 98-2249

FRANKLIN COUNTY, a North Carolina Body
Politic,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

GEORGE E. BURDICK, MARY K. BURDICK,

Defendants - Appellants,

and

BEN N. WILLIAMSON, III, Trustee: Farm Credit Bank of Columbia, Lienholder; JOHN TANTUM, Trustee: Nationscredit Financial Services Corporation of America, Lienholder,

Defendants.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. W. Earl Britt, Senior District Judge. (CA-97-481-5-BR-3, CA-97-482-5-BR-3, CA-97-483-5-BR-3, CA-97-484-5-BR-3)

Submitted: October 20, 1998

Decided: November 4, 1998

Before WILKINS and HAMILTON, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George E. Burdick, Mary K. Burdick, Appellants Pro Se. Steven Hume McFarlane, Louisburg, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In these four consolidated appeals, George and Mary Burdick appeal district court orders denying their motions for reconsideration and motions to amend their motions for reconsideration of four underlying orders remanding the four cases against them back to state court. Because the district court in this case remanded the cases on grounds expressly provided for in 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) (1994), lack of subject matter jurisdiction, we are precluded from reviewing the remand orders, see 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (1994), and consequently orders denying motions for reconsideration of remand orders. We note that 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c) also authorizes the district court to require a party to pay just costs and actual expenses, including attorney's fees.

In light of the foregoing, we dismiss these four appeals for lack of jurisdiction. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court, and oral argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED