UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-2330

B. K. CRUEY, PC; BILLY K. CRUEY,

Plaintiffs – Appellants,

v.

R. J. KIRBY, Individually, and as Deputy Sheriff, and as agent for J. T. Whitt, Sheriff, and Montgomery County, Virginia; D. L. CONNER, Individually, and as Deputy Sheriff, and as agent for J. T. Whitt, Sheriff, and Montgomery County, Virginia; J. T. WHITT, Individually, and as Sheriff, Montgomery County, Virginia, and as agent for Montgomery County, Virginia; BRUCE W. NESTER; UNKNOWN SUPERVISORS AND DEPUTIES, Montgomery County Sheriff's Department; RICKY LEE EARLY; ERIC NESTER; ROGER DALE NESTER; COUNTY OF MONTGOMERY, VIRGINIA,

Defendants – Appellees,

and

STEPHEN C. HUFF, JR.; ELINOR E. WILLIAMS, as Magistrate and Agent for the County of Montgomery, Virginia; KAREN SUE GARNAND, Magistrate and Agent for the County of Montgomery, Virginia; HOWARD M. GREGORY,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Chief District Judge. (7:09-cv-00516-gec)

Submitted: August 24, 2011 Decided: September 8, 2011

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Billy K. Cruey, B. K. CRUEY, PC, Shawsville, Virginia, for Appellants. Jim H. Guynn, Jr., GUYNN, MEMMER & DILLON, P.C., Salem, Virginia; Matthew E. Kelley, FRITH, ANDERSON & PEAKE, PC, Roanoke, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Billy K. Cruey and the law firm B. K. Cruey, PC, appeal the district court's orders dismissing certain Defendants, granting summary judgment to other Defendants, denying injunctive relief to Cruey, and declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over state-law claims in Cruey and the law firm's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) civil rights action. On appeal, Appellants question whether the district court erred in dismissing their § 1983 claims as to certain Defendants, denying injunctive relief, and refusing to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over certain of the state-law claims. However, because Appellants fail to support their claims in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A) ("[T]he [appellant's] argument . . . must contain . . . appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies."), we deem the claims waived. Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 607 (4th Cir. 2009); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. 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