

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-6374**

---

THERL TAYLOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

VIRGINIA GRUBBS; PAMALA SMITH; ANN HALLMAN; SHERMAN  
ANDERSON, Present Chief; VALERIE JONES; SUPERVISOR RANDALL  
WILLIAMS; JOHN PATE; ALLENDALE FAIRFAX COUNTY-CITY,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 17-6375**

---

THERL TAYLOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JOHN PATE; RANDALL WILLIAMS; TERESA RAMSEY; CONNIE  
BUEHNER; LT. CARTER, SCDC; SCDC; JANE DOE, Employees; JOHN DOE,  
Employees; PAMELA SMITH, AI Grievance Coordinator,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 17-6376**

---

THERL TAYLOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WALTER WORRICK; VIRGINIA GRUBBS; PAMELA SMITH; SCDC LT MR C  
HARTLEY; JOHN PATE; BRYAN STIRLING; JANE DOES; JOHN DOES,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at  
Charleston. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (2:15-cv-04958-RMG; 2:16-cv-02115-  
RMG; 2:16-cv-03084-RMG)

---

Submitted: October 28, 2019

Decided: November 7, 2019

---

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Therl Taylor, Appellant Pro Se. Claude E. Hardin, Jr., Daniel R. Settana, Jr., Ronald Keith  
Taylor, Jr., MCKAY FIRM, PA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Therl Taylor appeals the district court's orders accepting the recommendations of the magistrate judge and dismissing Taylor's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) complaints for failure to state a claim and counting each case as a strike.<sup>1</sup> We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court.<sup>2</sup> *Taylor v. Grubbs*, No. 2:15-cv-04958-RMG (D.S.C. Feb. 3, 2017); *Taylor v. Pate*, No. 2:16-cv-02115-RMG (D.S.C. Feb. 3, 2017); *Taylor v. Worrick*, No. 2:16-cv-03084-RMG (D.S.C. Feb. 3, 2017). 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*

---

<sup>1</sup> We previously determined that Taylor could proceed in forma pauperis in these appeals. See *Taylor v. Grubbs*, 930 F.3d 611, 614, 620 (4th Cir. 2019) (holding that, for purposes of three strikes rule of Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g) (2012), “a district court’s dismissal of a prisoner’s complaint does not, in an appeal of that dismissal, qualify as a ‘prior dismissal’”).

<sup>2</sup> In Appeal Nos. 17-6375 and 17-6376, Taylor forfeited appellate review of the district court’s orders because his informal briefs in those cases did not challenge the bases for the district court’s disposition. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (directing appellants to present “specific issues and supporting facts and arguments” in informal brief).