

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-2338**

---

MONICA L. BALL,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS AMERICA, INCORPORATED; TAKEDA  
PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANY LIMITED, a Japanese Corporation,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

TAKEDA PHARMACEUTICALS NORTH AMERICA, INCORPORATED; TAKEDA  
PHARMACEUTICALS INTERNATIONAL, INCORPORATED; TAKEDA  
PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC; TAKEDA AMERICA HOLDINGS, INC.; TAKEDA  
GLOBAL RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER, INC.; TAKEDA SAN  
DIEGO, INC.; TAP PHARMACEUTICALS PRODUCTS, INC.,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr.,  
District Judge. (3:13-cv-00168-JAG-MHL)

---

Submitted: November 26, 2014

Decided: December 15, 2014

---

Before MOTZ, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Monica L. Ball, Appellant Pro Se. Damon W.D. Wright, VENABLE,  
LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Monica Ball filed a diversity civil action against Takeda Pharmaceuticals America, Inc., Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Limited, and related defendants, alleging product liability and associated Virginia tort claims. On appeal, Ball challenges the district court's orders dismissing her original complaint, in part with leave to amend; dismissing her amended complaint with prejudice; and denying her post-judgment motions. We confine our review to those issues fairly raised in the opening brief. See Town of Nags Head v. Toloczko, 728 F.3d 391, 395 n.4 (4th Cir. 2013) (recognizing that arguments not raised in opening brief are waived). We have reviewed the record and submissions of the parties and find no reversible error or abuse of discretion in the district court's challenged rulings. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Ball v. Takeda Pharms. Am., Inc., No. 3:13-cv-00168-JAG-MHL (E.D. Va. Apr. 26, 2013; Aug. 8, 2013; Oct. 1, 2013). We deny Ball's motions for appointment of counsel and for an extension of time to file a reply brief. 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