

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-1656

KEITH F. KRAEMER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. C. Weston Houck, Senior District Judge. (2:15-cv-04571-CWH)

Submitted: September 25, 2017

Decided: November 13, 2017

Before TRAXLER and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Keith F. Kraemer, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Kathleen McTighe Mellen, Charles R. Norris, NELSON MULLINS RILEY & SCARBOROUGH, LLP, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Keith F. Kraemer appeals from the district court's April 26, 2017, order denying his motion seeking leave to amend his complaint and its April 28, 2017, order granting summary judgment to Defendant on the claims in his civil action for breach of contract and insurance bad faith, insofar as the claims relate to the termination of benefit payments on his 65th birthday. Kraemer's appellate arguments fail to explain how the district court reversibly erred in denying leave to amend his complaint. Accordingly, we deem this issue abandoned. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (directing appealing parties to present specific arguments in an informal brief and stating that this court's review on appeal is limited to the issues raised in the informal brief); *United States v. Holness*, 706 F.3d 579, 592 (4th Cir. 2013) (noting the "oft-cited rule that contentions not raised in the argument section of the opening brief are abandoned" (internal quotation marks omitted)); *Williams v. Giant Food Inc.*, 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004) (noting that appellate assertions not supported by argument are deemed abandoned).

We also have reviewed the record and find no reversible error in the district court's grant of summary judgment to Defendant. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. *Kraemer v. Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, No. 2:15-cv-04571-CWH (D.S.C. Apr. 26 & 28, 2017). 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