

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

TENTH CIRCUIT

June 4, 2014

Elisabeth A. Shumaker
Clerk of Court

RICHITA MARIE HACKFORD;
NATHAN S. COLLET; OPAL S.
HACKFORD; RICHARD D.
HACKFORD,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

STATE OF UTAH; DUCHESNE
COUNTY; ROOSEVELT CITY
CORPORATION; PETE BUTCHER,
Officer/Detective; DUCHESNE
COUNTY JAIL; WALLACE
HENDRICKS; ROOSEVELT ADULT
PROBATION & PAROLE; TOM
KOSMACK; BRAD DRAPER, Officer;
UINTAH COUNTY; VERNAL CITY
CORPORATION; UINTAH COUNTY
JAIL; CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER DAY SAINTS;
ROOSEVELT CITY POLICE
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 14-4027
(D.C. No. 2:11-CV-00084-DB)
(D. Utah)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **LUCERO**, **TYMKOVICH**, and **PHILLIPS**, Circuit Judges.

* After examining the briefs and the appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. Accordingly, the case is ordered submitted without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). This order and judgment is not binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, claim preclusion, and issue preclusion. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1 and Tenth Circuit Rule 32.1.

The district court dismissed this case because the plaintiffs failed to serve process on the defendants as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4. We conclude that the plaintiffs have forfeited their right to have that judgment reviewed. Even though the plaintiffs are pro se, their briefs contain no perceivable argument that the district erred in dismissing the case. *See Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer*, 425 F.3d 836, 840–41 (10th Cir. 2005) (affirming dismissal where a pro se plaintiff made no argument of substance in his briefs). We affirm the district court’s judgment.

ENTERED FOR THE COURT

Gregory A. Phillips
Circuit Judge