

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 25-1316

MURDOCK READY MIXED CONCRETE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

IRONPLANET, INC., in its official capacity; JAKE LAWSON, President; BRIAN PARKS, in his official capacity as Southeast Regional Manager; EMMA TUCKLEY, in her official capacity - Director of Sales & Customer Service,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Richard E. Myers, II, Chief District Judge. (5:24-cv-00256-M-BM)

Submitted: June 16, 2026

Decided: September 11, 2026

Before QUATTLEBAUM, RUSHING, and BENJAMIN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Curtis Sterling Murdock, III, Appellant Pro Se. Alexandra Harrington Austin, MAYNARD NEXSEN PC, Charleston, South Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Murdock Ready Mixed Concrete (“Murdock”) appeals the district court’s order accepting the magistrate judge’s recommendation, denying Murdock’s motions to consolidate and issue subpoenas, and dismissing Murdock’s civil complaint.¹ Our review of the record and Murdock’s filings on appeal leads us to conclude that Murdock has forfeited appellate review of the district court’s order by failing to file specific objections to the magistrate judge’s recommendation regarding the issues it raises on appeal and by failing to challenge in the informal brief the dispositive bases for the dismissal of its complaint.² *See Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017) (holding that, “to preserve for appeal an issue in a magistrate judge’s report, a party must object to the finding or recommendation on that issue with sufficient specificity so as reasonably to alert the district court of the true ground for the objection” (internal quotation marks omitted)); 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) (“The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief.”).

¹ Murdock has filed a motion for trial de novo and a motion to strike that motion. We grant the motion to strike.

² To the extent Murdock appeals the district court’s or magistrate judge’s denial of the various motions it filed in the district court, it has forfeited appellate review of those decisions by failing to develop his arguments on those issues. *See, e.g., G.M. by E.P. v. Barnes*, 114 F.4th 323, 337 n.7 (4th Cir. 2024) (“A party forfeits an argument by failing to develop it in the opening brief, even if its brief takes a passing shot at the issue.” (citation modified)).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. *Murdock Ready Mix Concrete v. Ironplanet, Inc.*, No. 5:24-cv-00256-M-BM (E.D.N.C. Mar. 3, 2025). 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