

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 20-1686

STACY FACEMIRE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

HEATHER MORRIS; PAMELA STUMPF; LULA V. DICKERSON; LISA
WILKINSON; KATHRYN A. BRADLEY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WEST VIRGINIA SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS; CHIEF JUSTICE
TIMOTHY PAUL ARMSTEAD, in his official capacity as Chief Justice,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

COMMISSION ON SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS; JIM JUSTICE; JOHN B.
MCCUSKEY; PATRICK MORRISEY; JOHN PERDUE; MAC WARNER; WEST
VIRGINIA OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE; WEST VIRGINIA OFFICE
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL; WEST VIRGINIA STATE AUDITOR'S
OFFICE; WEST VIRGINIA STATE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR; WEST
VIRGINIA STATE TREASURER'S OFFICE,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at
Wheeling. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (5:19-cv-00339-JPB)

Submitted: December 2, 2020

Decided: December 8, 2020

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

J. Michael Ranson, Cynthia M. Ranson, RANSON LAW OFFICES, PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia; G. Patrick Jacobs, LAW OFFICE OF G. PATRICK JACOBS, LC, Charleston, West Virginia; Teresa C. Toriseva, TORISEVA LAW, Wheeling, West Virginia; Robert G. McCoid, MCCOID LAW OFFICES, PLLC, Wheeling, West Virginia, for Appellants. Bryan R. Cokeley, Mark C. Dean, Robert L. Bailey, STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stacy Facemire appeals from the district court's order dismissing her suit as barred by claim and issue preclusion. In her opening brief, Facemire fails to challenge the basis for the district court's order. Even after being alerted to her failure in Appellees' brief, Facemire still did not address res judicata in her reply brief. Accordingly, we conclude that Facemire has waived any objection to the district court's conclusions. *See Suarez-Valenzuela v. Holder*, 714 F.3d 241, 248-49 (4th Cir. 2013) (citing Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)). As such, we affirm. 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