UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1598

In re: DAHLIA MEDITERRANEAN, LLC,

Debtor,

ABDALLA HASHISH,

Debtor Designee - Appellant,

and

WESAM HASHISH,

Appellant,

v.

KEVIN R. MCCARTHY,

Trustee - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:24-cv-01733-CMH-IDD)

Submitted: August 7, 2026 Decided: September 2, 2026

Before THACKER and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Abdalla Hashish, Wesam Hashish, Appellants Pro Se. Kevin R. McCarthy, MCCARTHY & WHITE, PLLC, Vienna, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Abdalla Hashish and Wesam Hashish appeal the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order approving a settlement agreement.[1] "We review the judgment of a district court sitting in review of a bankruptcy court de novo, applying the same standards that the district court applied." *Trantham v. Tate*, 112 F.4th 223, 230 (4th Cir. 2024). We thus "review the bankruptcy court's legal conclusions de novo, its factual findings for clear error, and any discretionary decisions for abuse of discretion." *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). "[A] bankruptcy court's approval of a settlement . . . is within its sound discretion." *St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Vaughn*, 779 F.2d 1003, 1010 (4th Cir. 1985); *see* Fed. R. Bankr. P. 9019.

Liberally construing Appellants' informal brief to challenge the district court's order, *see Wall v. Rasnick*, 42 F.4th 214, 218 (4th Cir. 2022), we have reviewed the record and discern no reversible error in the approval of the settlement agreement.[2] Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Hashish v. McCarthy*, No. 1:24-cv-01733-CMH-IDD (E.D. Va. Apr. 29, 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.

[1] Appellants have moved to supplement the record on appeal, for identification and inventory of record materials, and to either further supplement the record or take judicial notice of newly discovered records. We deny those motions.

[2] We express no opinion on Appellants' assignments of error that are not related to the order before us on appeal.

AFFIRMED