

**UNPUBLISHED**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

---

**No. 20-7282**

---

KUNTA KENTA REDD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

JAMES C. DEVER, III, United States Federal Sentencing Judge; ROBERT J. DODSON, United States District Attorney; MICHAEL JAMES, United States District Attorney; TIMOTHY M. SEVERO, United States District Attorney,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. Louise W. Flanagan, District Judge. (5:19-ct-03395-FL)

---

Submitted: November 19, 2020

Decided: November 24, 2020

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kunta Kenta Redd, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kunta Kenta Redd appeals from the district court's order dismissing under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) his civil action filed pursuant to *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). The court determined that Redd's claims were barred in their entirety by the applicable statute of limitations. The court also determined that Redd's claims were barred by judicial and prosecutorial immunity, barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), and sought barred or unavailable remedies.

On appeal, \* we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Redd's informal brief does not challenge the bases for the district court's disposition, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We deny Redd's motion to appoint counsel and 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*

---

\* Although the district court dismissed Redd's action without prejudice, we conclude after review of the record in light of *Bing v. Brivo Sys., LLC*, 959 F.3d 605, 610-12, 614-15 (4th Cir. 2020), that the dismissal is final and appealable.