Erik Dunlap v. Educational Credit Management Appeal: 17-1227 Doc: 32 Filed: 09/07/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1227
n Re: ERIK M. DUNLAP,
Debtor.
ERIK M. DUNLAP,
Plaintiff - Appellant,
v.
EDUCATIONAL CREDIT MANAGEMENT CORPORATION,
Defendant - Appellee.
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Robert J. Conrad, Jr., District Judge. (3:16-cv-00037-RJC)
Submitted: August 24, 2017 Decided: September 7, 2017
Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.
Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Doc. 406675732

Appeal: 17-1227 Doc: 32 Filed: 09/07/2017 Pg: 2 of 3

Kenneth Love, KARRENSTEIN, LOVE, AND DILLENBECK, Matthews, North Carolina, for Appellant. Lisa P. Sumner, NEXSEN PRUET, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

During the course of his bankruptcy proceedings, Erik M. Dunlap filed an adversary proceeding seeking partial discharge of his student loan debt pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(8) (2012). The bankruptcy court dismissed Dunlap's complaint. Dunlap appealed and the district court dismissed Dunlap's appeal for failure to comply with Fed. R. Bankr. P. 8009(a)(1) as Dunlap had failed properly to designate the issues for appeal. Dunlap now appeals to this court. In his opening brief, however, Dunlap failed to challenge the procedural basis for the district court's dismissal of his appeal. Dunlap, therefore, has forfeited appellate review of the district court's order. See Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A); see also Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 605 n.13 (4th Cir. 2009) (failure to challenge issue on appeal waives appellate review of issue); Skinner v. First Union Nat'l Bank, No. 98-1627, 1999 WL 261944, at *1-*2 (4th Cir. May 3, 1999) (argued but unpublished) (where district court dismissed appeal of bankruptcy court order for failure to timely file brief, only orders properly on appeal were district court's orders of dismissal and denying reconsideration).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. 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