

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-2070**

---

PUBLIC-SECTOR SOLUTIONS, INC.,

Debtor - Appellant,

v.

HUNT & ASSOCIATES, P.C.,

Creditor - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.  
James K. Bredar, Chief District Judge. (1:21-cv-02424-JKB)

---

Submitted: March 28, 2023

Decided: May 1, 2023

---

Before WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and KEENAN, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

**ON BRIEF:** Arthur G. Kahn, ARTHUR G. KAHN, PLLC, Silver Spring, Maryland, for Appellant. Alan M. Grochal, TYDINGS & ROSENBERG LLP, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Public-Sector Solutions, Inc. (“PSS”) appeals the district court’s order affirming the bankruptcy court’s order denying PSS’s motion to reopen its bankruptcy case. “In reviewing the judgment of a district court sitting in review of a bankruptcy court, we apply the same standard of review that was applied by the district court.” *Copley v. United States*, 959 F.3d 118, 121 (4th Cir. 2020). Thus, “we review the bankruptcy court’s legal conclusions de novo, its factual findings for clear error, and any discretionary decisions for abuse of discretion.” *Id.*

As a threshold matter, we mostly agree with Appellee Hunt & Associates, P.C. that PSS has forfeited appellate review by either failing to raise its arguments before the bankruptcy court or failing to challenge the basis of the bankruptcy court’s decision. *See Hicks v. Ferreyra*, 965 F.3d 302, 310 (4th Cir. 2020); *Grayson O Co. v. Agadir Int’l, LLC*, 856 F.3d 307, 316 (4th Cir. 2017); *Rusnack v. Cardinal Bank, N.A.*, 695 F. App’x 704, 711 (4th Cir. 2017) (No. 16-1676) (argued but unpublished). We conclude that PSS properly preserved its challenge to the bankruptcy court’s factual findings. But we find no clear error in these findings.

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*