

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 24-1633

EDWARD BERNARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JACOB RIDEOUT,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
Matthew James Maddox, District Judge. (1:23-cv-02235-MJM)

Submitted: April 30, 2026

Decided: June 4, 2026

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

ON BRIEF: Latoya Francis-Williams, LAW OFFICE OF LATOYA A. FRANCIS-WILLIAMS, Randallstown, Maryland; Sheridan T. Yeary, THE YEARY FIRM, LLC, Columbia, Maryland, for Appellant. Anthony G. Brown, Attorney General, Amy E. Hott, Assistant Attorney General, Everett C. Bryant, Assistant Attorney General, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Pikesville, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Edward Bernard appeals the district court's order denying his motion to strike, treating Defendant's motion to dismiss or for summary judgment as a motion for summary judgment, and granting summary judgment to Defendant on all claims in his seven-count civil action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and Maryland state law. On appeal, Bernard contends that the district court erred in denying the motion to strike, in converting Defendant's motion to one for summary judgment, and in granting summary judgment to Defendant on six of the seven counts.*

Because Bernard's briefing does not present properly developed argument challenging the district court's denial of the motion to strike and its grant of summary judgment to Defendant on counts I, V, VI, and VII, we conclude that he has waived appellate review of these rulings. *See Just Puppies, Inc. v. Brown*, 123 F.4th 652, 660 n.4 (4th Cir. 2024); *United States v. Miller*, 41 F.4th 302, 313 (4th Cir. 2022); *Timpson ex rel. Timpson v. Anderson Cnty. Disabilities & Special Needs Bd.*, 31 F.4th 238, 256-57 (4th Cir. 2022). We also discern no abuse of discretion, *see E.W. by & through T.W. v. Dolgos*, 884 F.3d 172, 178 n.2 (4th Cir. 2018) (noting standard of review), in the district court's treatment of Defendant's motion as a motion for summary judgment and no reversible error in the district court's grant of summary judgment to Defendant, *see Aleman v. City of*

* Bernard presents on appeal no argument challenging the district court's grant of summary judgment to Defendant on count II, and he has therefore abandoned this issue. *United States v. Walton*, 145 F.4th 476, 489 (4th Cir. 2025), *cert. denied*, No. 25-6271, 2026 WL 79708 (Jan. 12, 2026).

Charlotte, 80 F.4th 264, 283 (4th Cir. 2023) (noting that de novo standard governs review of district court decision on summary judgment motion), on counts III and IV. 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