UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1801

AMERICAN HEARTLAND PORT, INCORPORATED; JO LYNN KRAINA; SHELLEY REED; MISTY SHANNON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

AMERICAN PORT HOLDINGS, INCORPORATED, a Delaware corporation; PATRICK NICHOLAS DICARLO, an individual; ARCELORMITTAL WEIRTON LLC, a corporation; DANIEL L. DICKERSON, individually; ANDREW S. FELLOWS, individually; JAMES C. BRECKINRIDGE, individually,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ALLIED INVESTMENT PARTNERS PJSC, a foreign corporation; ARCELORMITTAL WEIRTON INCORPORATED; STANLEY BALLAS, individually; CHANNEL POINT PARTNERS, a corporation; JAMES MARTODAM, individually,

Defendants.

No. 14-1809

AMERICAN HEARTLAND PORT, INCORPORATED; JO LYNN KRAINA; SHELLEY REED; MISTY SHANNON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

AMERICAN PORT HOLDINGS, INCORPORATED, a Delaware corporation; PATRICK NICHOLAS DICARLO, an individual;

Appeal: 14-1801 Doc: 81 Filed: 12/15/2015 Pg: 2 of 4

ARCELORMITTAL WEIRTON LLC, a corporation; DANIEL L. DICKERSON, individually; ANDREW S. FELLOWS, individually; JAMES C. BRECKINRIDGE, individually,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ALLIED INVESTMENT PARTNERS PJSC, a foreign corporation; ARCELORMITTAL WEIRTON INCORPORATED; JAMES MARTODAM, individually; STANLEY BALLAS, individually; CHANNEL POINT PARTNERS, a corporation,

Defendants.

No. 14-2249

AMERICAN HEARTLAND PORT, INCORPORATED; JO LYNN KRAINA; SHELLEY REED; MISTY SHANNON,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

AMERICAN PORT HOLDINGS, INCORPORATED, a Delaware corporation; PATRICK NICHOLAS DICARLO, an individual; ARCELORMITTAL WEIRTON LLC, a corporation; DANIEL L. DICKERSON, individually; ANDREW S. FELLOWS, individually; JAMES C. BRECKINRIDGE, individually,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

ALLIED INVESTMENT PARTNERS PJSC, a foreign corporation; ARCELORMITTAL WEIRTON INCORPORATED; JAMES MARTODAM, individually; STANLEY BALLAS, individually; CHANNEL POINT PARTNERS, a corporation,

Defendants.

Appeal: 14-1801 Doc: 81 Filed: 12/15/2015 Pg: 3 of 4

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at Wheeling. Frederick P. Stamp, Jr., Senior District Judge. (5:11-cv-00050-FPS-JES)

Submitted: November 24, 2015 Decided: December 15, 2015

Before MOTZ and AGEE, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

John Hampton Tinney, Jr., TINNEY LAW FIRM, PLLC, Charleston, West Virginia, for Appellants. Wendy G. Adkins, Stephen Michael LaCagnin, JACKSON KELLY, PLLC, Morgantown, West Virginia; Dennis Joseph Powers, Kenneth L. Schmetterer, DLA PIPER US LLP, Chicago, Illinois, for Appellees. Patrick Nicholas DiCarlo, Newport Beach, California, Appellee Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

American Heartland Port, Inc., Jo Lynn Kraina, Shelley Reed, and Misty Shannon (collectively, Plaintiffs) appeal the district court's order dismissing their claims against Patrick Nicholas DiCarlo (No. 14-1801) and the order granting summary judgment to ArcelorMittal Weirton, LLC (No. 14-1809).* We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm. Am. Heartland Port, Inc. v. Am. Port Holdings, Inc., No. 5:11-cv-00050-FPS-JES (N.D. W. Va. Mar. 21, 2014; July 17, 2014 & Oct. 8, 2014).

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

^{*} Plaintiffs also noted an appeal of the district court's order denying their motion for new trial, entered on October 8, 2014 (No. 14-2249). Because Plaintiffs failed to brief this issue in their informal opening brief, they have waived any challenge to that order. See 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."). To the extent Plaintiffs' argument in their brief challenging the district court's denial of their motion for a protective order relates to their motion for new trial, we find no reversible error.