

NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FULL-TEXT PUBLICATION

File Name: 12a1044n.06

No. 11-2169

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT**



DOUGLAS CARL; MARY CARL,)
)
 Plaintiffs-Appellants,)
)
 v.) ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED
) STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
) EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
 BAC HOME LOANS SERVICING, LP,)
)
 Defendant-Appellee.)

Before: GIBBONS and COOK, Circuit Judges; and ROSENTHAL, District Judge.*

PER CURIAM. The Carls appeal from the district court’s Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal (and denial of reconsideration) of their claims to void the foreclosure that deprived them of their Michigan home. In the absence of reasoned argument setting forth specific legal grounds that would support this court’s voiding the foreclosure, we affirm the district court’s judgment. The appellate brief includes just 595 words in the argument section (including headings and articles) and only two citations to Michigan statutes, without argument advocating a reading of those statutes. The Carls make no effort to show how the district court erred. They supply only allegations and recitation of their preferred appellate result. *See United States v. Johnson*, 440 F.3d 832, 845–46 (6th Cir. 2006) (“[I]ssues adverted to in a perfunctory manner, unaccompanied by some effort at developed

*The Honorable Lee H. Rosenthal, United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, sitting by designation.

Nos. 11-3434/11-3497
United States v. Sarlog

argumentation, are deemed waived.” (internal quotation marks omitted) (citing *United States v. Elder*, 90 F.3d 1110, 1118 (6th Cir. 1996))).

We AFFIRM the judgment of the district court.