

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 11-1608

In re: Genmar Holdings, Inc.; Carver	*
Italia, LLC; Carver Yachts	*
International, LLC; Genmar	*
Minnesota, Inc.; Carver Industries,	*
LLC; Genmar Florida, Inc.; Genmar	*
Industries, Inc.; Genmar IP, LLC;	*
Genmar Manufacturing of Kansas, Inc.;	*
Genmar Michigan, LLC; Genmar	*
Tennessee, Inc., Formerly doing	*
business as Stratos Boats, Inc., also	*
known as Champion Boats, also	*
known as Hydra Sport Boats; Genmar	*
Transportation, Inc.; Genmar Yacht	*
Group, LLC, Formerly doing business	*
as Carver Boat Corporation LLC, also	*
known as Carver Boats, also known as	*
Marquis Boats; Marine Media, LLC;	*
Minstar, LLC; Triumph Boats, Inc.,	*
Triumph Boats; Triumph Boat Rentals,	*
LLC; VEC Leasing Services, LLC;	*
VEC Management Co., LLC; VEC	*
Technology, Inc.; Windsor Craft	*
Yachts, LLC; Wood Manufacturing	*
Company, Inc.,	*
Debtors,	*
-----	*
David Scot Lynd,	*
Appellant,	*
	*

v.	*
	*
Genmar Holdings, Inc.; Carver Italia, LLC; Carver Yachts International,	*
LLC; Genmar Minnesota, Inc.;	*
Carver Industries, LLC; Genmar	*
Florida, Inc.; Genmar Industries, Inc.;	*
Genmar IP, LLC; Genmar	*
Manufacturing of Kansas, Inc.; Genmar	*
Michigan, LLC; Genmar Tennessee, Inc.; Genmar Transportation, Inc.;	*
Genmar Yacht Group, LLC; Marine	*
Media, LLC; Minstar, LLC; Triumph	*
Boats, Inc.; Triumph Boat Rentals,	*
LLC; VEC Leasing Services, LLC;	*
VEC Management Co., LLC; VEC	*
Technology, Inc.; Windsor Craft	*
Yachts, LLC; Wood Manufacturing	*
Company, Inc.,	*
	*
Appellees.	*

Submitted: December 7, 2011
Filed: December 19, 2011

Before MELLOY, BOWMAN, and SHEPHERD, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

David Scot Lynd appeals from an order of the Bankruptcy Appellate Panel (BAP) dismissing his appeal for failure to prosecute because he did not pay the filing fee. In his opening brief submitted to this Court, Lynd does not mention the filing-fee issue, addressing instead the merits of his underlying bankruptcy-court claim. Issues

not raised in an opening brief are deemed waived. See Jenkins v. Winter, 540 F.3d 742, 751 (8th Cir. 2008). Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal because Lynd has not articulated any reason why the BAP's dismissal order was improper and thus has not presented this court with any question for decision. See Carter v. Lutheran Med. Ctr., 87 F.3d 1025, 1026 (8th Cir. 1996) (per curiam); Slack v. St. Louis Cnty. Gov't, 919 F.2d 98, 99–100 (8th Cir. 1990) (per curiam).
