

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-1838

SENS, INC.; ROY SENS; MELANIE SUSAN SENS; SENS MECHANICAL,
INC,

Plaintiffs – Appellees,

v.

WHITEFORD TAYLOR AND PRESTON, LLP; THOMAS CARROLL BEACH,
III,

Defendants – Appellants,

and

MONIQUE D. ALMY,

Trustee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Lydia Kay Griggsby, District Judge. (1:21-cv-02520-LKG; 1:21-cv-02988-LKG)

Submitted: April 25, 2023

Decided: November 9, 2023

Before QUATTLEBAUM and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Kevin G. Hroblak, WHITEFORD TAYLOR & PRESTON LLP, Baltimore, Maryland; Alvin I. Frederick, ECCLESTON & WOLF, P.C., Hanover, Maryland, for Appellants. Patrick Donald Gardiner, Wes Patrick Henderson, HENDERSON LAW, LLC, Crofton, Maryland; Christopher G. Hoge, CROWLEY, HODE & FEIN, PC, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiffs filed a legal malpractice suit in Maryland against Defendants White Taylor & Preston, LLP, and Thomas Carroll Beach, III, for providing advice that allegedly resulted in an adverse legal ruling holding Plaintiffs liable for up to \$17.5 million in damages. Defendants moved to dismiss Plaintiffs' suit as time-barred under Maryland's general three-year statute of limitations. The bankruptcy court denied the motion, concluding that Plaintiffs' complaints were timely filed because the limitations period commenced when Plaintiffs received the adverse ruling. The bankruptcy court's order resolved all pending issues and concluded the adversary proceeding. On appeal, the district court affirmed the bankruptcy court's decision.

“We review the judgment of a district court sitting in review of a bankruptcy court de novo, applying the same standards of review that were applied in the district court.” *In re Merry-Go-Round Enters., Inc.*, 400 F.3d 219, 224 (4th Cir. 2005). “Specifically, we review the bankruptcy court's factual findings for clear error, while we review questions of law de novo.” *Id.* Having reviewed the record, we see no reversible error and thus affirm. 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