UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1142

CURTIS STERLING MURDOCK, III,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

IRONPLANET, INC.; JAKE LAWSON, in his official capacity; BRIAN PARKS, in his official capacity; EMMA TUCKLEY, in her official capacity,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Richard E. Myers, II, Chief District Judge. (5:23-cv-00580-M-BM)

Submitted: June 16, 2026 Decided: August 28, 2026

Before QUATTLEBAUM, RUSHING, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Curtis Sterling Murdock, III, Appellant Pro Se. Alexandra Harrington Austin, MAYNARD NEXSEN PC, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Curtis Sterling Murdock, III, appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation, denying Murdock's motion to consolidate, and dismissing Murdock's amended complaint.[1] Our review of the record and Murdock's filings on appeal leads us to conclude that Murdock has forfeited appellate review of the district court's order by failing to file specific objections to the magistrate judge's recommendation as to the issues he raises on appeal and by failing to challenge in his informal briefs the dispositive bases for the dismissal of the amended complaint.[2] *See Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (holding that, "to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge's report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection" (internal quotation marks omitted)); 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *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.").

[1] Murdock has filed several motions in this Court, including for leave to file attachments, for a trial, and to strike. We grant his motion to strike, strike the motions for trial, and deny all other pending motions.

[2] To the extent Murdock challenges the magistrate judge's denial of his non-dispositive motions, he has forfeited appellate review of those portions of the magistrate judge's order by failing to develop his arguments on those issues. *See, e.g.*, *G.M. by E.P. v. Barnes*, 114 F.4th 323, 337 n.7 (4th Cir. 2024) ("A party forfeits an argument by failing to develop it in the opening brief, even if its brief takes a passing shot at the issue." (citation modified)).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Murdock v. Ironplanet, Inc.*, No. 5:23-cv-00580-M-BM (E.D.N.C. Jan. 14, 2025). 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