## 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.

<sup>\*</sup> 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 This order and judgment is not binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, claim preclusion, and issue preclusion.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

- 2 -