

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 97-11271
Summary Calendar

ANAND P. AGARWAL; URMILA AGARWAL,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

versus

RHONALD MORRIS; BETTY MORRIS, Substitute Trustee; JOHN
BAYLESS; SHIRLEY SMITH,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -
Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of Texas
(94-CV-2623-P)
- - - - -

February 15, 1999

Before JOLLY, SMITH, and WIENER, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

Plaintiffs-Appellants Anand and Urmila Agarwal appeal the district court's denial of their motions for remand of their complaint to state court and the court's grant of Defendant-Appellees' motion for summary judgment, dismissing the Agarwals' claims.

They argue first that the court erred by dismissing their claims of (1) breach of contract; (2) promissory estoppel; (3) wrongful acceleration and foreclosure; (4) unjust enrichment;

* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

(5) conspiracy; (6) interference with contractual relations, and myriad other claims. As a preliminary issue, we conclude that despite the Agarwals' imprecise notice of appeal, we have jurisdiction to review their claims that remand was warranted. See New York Life Ins. Co. v. Deshotel, 142 F.3d 873, 884 (5th Cir. 1998). Regarding the remand issue, however, we find no abuse of discretion. McClelland v. Gronwaldt, 155 F.3d 507, 519 (5th Cir. 1998).

With regard to the merits of the Agarwals' complaint, we have reviewed de novo the record and the briefs of the parties and conclude that the district court correctly granted summary judgment. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons given by that court. See Agarwal v. Morris, No. 3:94-CV-2623-P (N.D. Tex.; Jul 8, 1996, and Oct. 1, 1997).

AFFIRMED.