

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1378

BARBARA ANN KELLY,

Plaintiff – Appellant,

GREGORY B. MYERS,

Debtor,

v.

MCNAMEE, HOSEA, JERNIGAN, GREEN & LYNCH, P.A.,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

ROGER SCHLOSSBERG,

Trustee – Appellee.

No. 22-1379

GREGORY B. MYERS,

Debtor – Appellant,

BARBARA ANN KELLY,

Plaintiff,

v.

MCNAMEE, HOSEA, JERNIGAN, GREEN & LYNCH, P.A.,

Defendant – Appellee,

and

ROGER SCHLOSSBERG,

Trustee – Appellee.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. George Jarrod Hazel, District Judge. (8:21-cv-01186-GJH; 8:21-cv-01184-GJH; 8:21-cv-01185-GJH)

Submitted: August 24, 2023

Decided: August 28, 2023

Before QUATTLEBAUM and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Barbara Ann Kelly and Gregory B. Myers, Appellants Pro Se. Daniel Russell Hodges, ECCLESTON & WOLF, PC, Hanover, Maryland; Frank Joseph Mastro, SCHLOSSBERG MASTRO, Hagerstown, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Barbara Ann Kelly and Gregory B. Myers appeal the district court's order dismissing their bankruptcy appeals for failure to timely file designations of the records on appeal as required by Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8009(a)(1). On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because the informal briefs filed by Kelly and Myers do not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, they have forfeited appellate review of the district court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. Additionally, we deny Kelly's and Myers' motions to dismiss their appeals without prejudice, deny the Appellees' motions to dismiss the appeals, and deny the Trustee's motion for sanctions. 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