

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7358

STANLEY LEE MOULTRIE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WILLIAM BYARS, JR., South Carolina Department of Corrections Director; BRYAN P. STIRLING; GOVERNOR NIKKI HALEY; ATTORNEY GENERAL ALAN WILSON; DEPUTY DIRECTOR ROBERT WARD; SCDC GENERAL COUNSEL DAYNE HAILE; CHRISTOPHER FLORIAN; ANN HALLMAN, Agency Grievance Coordinator; MARIA LEGGINS, Agency Mailroom Coordinator; WILLIE EAGLETON, Evan Warden; ASSOCIATE WARDEN MCFADDEN; MAJOR C. WEST; BETHEA LT. MICHAEL TOMS; MS. BAKER, Mailroom Coordinator; MS. GRAVES, ECI Grievance Coordinator; PAMELA MCDOWELL, Mailroom Supervisor; LT. JAMES MARTIN; SGT. H. SIMS; ASSOCIATE WARDEN BUSH, Lee CI; ASSOCIATE WARDEN NOLAN; ASSOCIATE WARDEN DEAN; K. RIVERS, Lee CI Grievance Coordinator; JIMMY SLEIGH; DEPUTY WARDEN; LT. JACK BROWN; MS. CONYERS, Lee CI Officer; GENERAL COUNSEL TATARSKY; DEPUTY DIRECTOR MCCALL; AMY SMITH; D. EASTRIDGE; FELICIA MCQUEEN; SANDRA BOWIE; DEPUTY WARDEN DAVIS; CAPTAIN THOMAS; MS. WILSON,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. David C. Norton, District Judge. (9:14-cv-01690-DCN)

Submitted: February 25, 2016

Decided: February 29, 2016

Before SHEDD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Stanley Lee Moultrie, Appellant Pro Se. Jerome Scott Kozacki,
WILCOX BUYCK & WILLIAMS, PA, Florence, South Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Stanley Lee Moultrie appeals the district court's order adopting the magistrate judge's recommendation and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaint. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Moultrie's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, Moultrie has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. 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