

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-2298

PEOPLE FOR THE ETHICAL TREATMENT OF ANIMALS, INC.,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

TRI-STATE ZOOLOGICAL PARK OF WESTERN MARYLAND; ANIMAL PARK, CARE & RESCUE, INC.; ROBERT L. CANDY,

Defendants - Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Paula Xinis, District Judge. (1:17-cv-02148-PX)

Submitted: November 30, 2021

Decided: January 6, 2022

Before NIEMEYER and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Lynn T. Krause, KAGAN, STERN, MARINELLO & BEARD, LLC; Nevin L. Young, Annapolis, Maryland, for Appellants. Adam B. Abelson, Baltimore, Maryland, Marcos E. Hasbun, ZUCKERMAN SPAEDER LLP, Tampa, Florida; Caitlin Hawks, Zeynep Graves, PETA FOUNDATION, Los Angeles, California, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tri-State Zoological Park of Western Maryland, Inc., Animal Park, Care & Rescue, Inc., Robert L. Candy (collectively, “Defendants”) and Defendants’ counsel Nevin Young appeal from the district court’s post-judgment order denying Defendants’ motion for reconsideration and ordering Defendants and Young to pay, jointly and severally, \$56,655.77 in attorney’s fees and costs as a sanction for misconduct, raising a variety of claims.

We question whether Appellants have presented their claims in accordance with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(8)(A), which requires the argument section of appellants’ opening briefs to contain their “contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies.” *See Sky Cable, LLC v. DIRECTV, Inc.*, 886 F.3d 375, 383 n.3 (4th Cir. 2018) (deeming appellants’ argument abandoned for failure to comply with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A)); *EEOC v. Md. Ins. Admin.*, 879 F.3d 114, 122 n.10 (4th Cir. 2018) (same). Nevertheless, to the extent we can discern the legal basis for Appellants’ arguments, we find them unconvincing. *See Pac. Ins. Co. v. Am. Nat. Fire Ins. Co.*, 148 F.3d 396, 402 (4th Cir. 1998) (reviewing denial of a motion for reconsideration for abuse of discretion); *see also Brubaker v. City of Richmond*, 943 F.2d 1363, 1387 (4th Cir. 1991) (reviewing imposition of sanctions for abuse of discretion). Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s order. *People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, Inc. v. Tri-State Zoological Park of W. Md.*, No. 1:17-cv-02148-PX (D. Md. Oct. 29, 2020).

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