

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-1960**

---

GAIL B. SPARROW; VICTOR H. SPARROW, III,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

BANK OF AMERICA, NA; NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE HOLDINGS INC.;  
NATIONSTAR MORTGAGE, LLC; THE FISHER LAW GROUP, PLLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
Maryland, at Greenbelt. J. Frederick Motz, Senior District  
Judge. (8:14-cv-00388-JFM)

---

Submitted: April 23, 2015

Decided: May 4, 2015

---

Before KEENAN, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gail B. Sparrow, Victor H. Sparrow, III, Appellants Pro Se.  
Craig Robert Haughton, Jessica Erin Morrison, MCGUIREWOODS, LLP,  
Baltimore, Maryland; Monica E. Webb, MCGUIREWOODS, LLP, Raleigh,  
North Carolina; Jeffrey Barry Fisher, Martin Stuart Goldberg,  
FISHER LAW GROUP, Upper Marlboro, Maryland, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Gail B. Sparrow and Victor H. Sparrow, III (together, "Sparrows"), appeal the district court's orders granting Defendants' motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), and denying related motions for judicial notice.\* On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellants' brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because the Sparrows' informal brief does not sufficiently challenge the bases for the district court's dispositions, the Sparrows arguably have forfeited appellate review of the court's order. In any event, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the district court's denial of relief. Nor did the district court abuse its discretion in failing to address the Sparrows' request for leave to amend the complaint, which they presented only in a responsive pleading. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 7(b), 15(a);

---

\* Appellee the Fisher Law Group, PLLC ("Fisher") has moved to dismiss the appeal on the ground that Victor Sparrow alone signed the notice of appeal and Gail Sparrow did not. We deny the motion pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 3(c)(2). See Becker v. Montgomery, 532 U.S. 757, 766-67 (2001). In so doing, we conclude that Fisher's reliance on Picking v. Yates, 288 A.2d 146 (Md. 1972), is misplaced. We deny Fisher's subsequent motion to strike a letter filed by Gail Sparrow regarding her status as a party to the appeal because the letter does not prejudice Fisher's rights in any way.

Cozzarelli v. Inspire Pharm. Inc., 549 F.3d 618, 630-31 (4th Cir. 2008).

Accordingly, we affirm. We deny the Sparrows' motions for judicial notice filed in this court and 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