

FILED

United States Court of Appeals
Tenth Circuit

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

May 6, 2026

FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

Christopher M. Wolpert
Clerk of Court

EDWARD H. HOID; MAXWELL
HEMRIC,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

SELECT JUSTICE LLC; DOLMAN
LAW GROUP; MILLER AND ZOIS
LLC; FARR LAW FIRM; LEVY
KONIGSBERG; SINGLETON
SCHREIBER; GOOGLE,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 25-1431
(Case No. 1:25-CV-02228-JLK-RTG)
(D. Colo.)

ORDER AND JUDGMENT*

Before **BACHARACH**, **McHUGH**, and **CARSON**, Circuit Judges.

Mr. Edward Hoid and Mr. Maxwell Hemric appeal the dismissal without prejudice of their civil rights action.

* Oral argument would not help us decide the appeal, so we have decided the appeal based on the record and the briefing. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)(C); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G).

This order and judgment does not constitute binding precedent except under the doctrines of law of the case, *res judicata*, and collateral estoppel. But the order and judgment may be cited for its persuasive value if otherwise appropriate. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 32.1(a); 10th Cir. R. 32.1(A).

The appellants alleged membership in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. As members of the Church, the appellants sued law firms, Google, and ABC News based on these organizations' airing of allegations of sexual abuse within the Church. The crux of the claims is that these organizations harmed the Church through religious persecution. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without prejudice for lack of standing and violation of pleading requirements, and the district judge adopted the recommendations.

In their appellate brief, Mr. Hoid and Mr. Hemric do not challenge the district court's reasoning. Instead, they assert only that the district court acted "with hate and prejudice." Appellant's Opening Br. at 4. By failing to address the district court's reasoning, Mr. Hoid and Mr. Hemric have waived appellate review of the dismissal. *See Clark v. Colbert*, 895 F.3d 1258, 1265 (10th Cir. 2018) (stating that "we will not question the reasoning of a district court unless an appellant 'actually argue[s]' against it") (quoting *Phillips v. Calhoun*, 956 F.2d 949, 954 (10th Cir. 1992) (alteration in original)).

We thus affirm the dismissal.¹

Entered for the Court

Robert E. Bacharach
Circuit Judge

¹ We grant the appellants' motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis.