

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1678

ESTATE OF DORIS HOLT; RODNEY KEITH LAIL; IRENE SANTACROCE,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

JAMES SPENCER; SOUTHERN HOLDINGS, INCORPORATED; RICKY
STEPHENS; MARGUERITE STEPHENS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

HORRY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA; HORRY COUNTY POLICE
DEPARTMENT; JAMES ALBERT ALLEN, JR.; SIDNEY RICK THOMPSON;
JEFFREY S. CALDWELL; CHARLES MCCLENDON; JAY BRANTLY; ANDY
CHRISTENSEN; DAVID SMITH; MICHAEL STEVEN HARTNESS; HAROLD
STEVEN HARTNESS; ANCIL B. GARVIN, III,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge.
(4:02-cv-01859-RBH)

Submitted: May 31, 2016

Decided: June 10, 2016

Before KING, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Michael G. Sribnick, M.D., J.D., LLC, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellants. Andrew F. Lindemann, DAVIDSON & LINDEMANN, P.A., Columbus, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

The Appellants, the estate of Doris Holt, Rodney Keith Lail, and Irene Santacroce, appeal the district court's order denying their most recent motion for vacatur of the court's 2007 order confirming the settlement of their claims and dismissing the case with prejudice, and denying recusal of the district court judge. As the notice of appeal explicitly specified this order, that is the only order before this court. See Fed. R. App. P. 3(c)(1)(B); see also Jackson v. Lightsey, 775 F.3d 170, 176 (4th Cir. 2014). In their opening brief, however, the Appellants fail to challenge the district court's order, and have therefore forfeited appellate review of that order. See Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., 562 F.3d 599, 605 n.13 (4th Cir. 2009) (citing Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A)). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order and deny the Appellants' motions for judicial notice, for recusal, to amend, and to appoint a special master. 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 in the decisional process.

AFFIRMED