

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-6598

PRIEST MOMOLU V.S. SIRLEAF, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CHADWICK DOTSON; A. DAVIDE ROBINSON; MARK E. PEARSON; MARK
E. ENGELKE; CHAPLAIN HOLLENBAUGH; CYNTHIA PUTNEY; LOUISE G.
GOODE,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

D. Y. KINSLEY,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at
Richmond. M. Hannah Lauck, District Judge. (3:18-cv-00311-MHL-EWH)

Submitted: October 31, 2023

Decided: November 20, 2023

Before NIEMEYER, GREGORY, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed in part and affirmed in part by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Priest Momolu V.S. Sirleaf, Jr., Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Priest Momolu V.S. Sirleaf, Jr., a former Virginia prisoner, appeals the district court’s final order denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. We limit our review to issues raised in the informal brief, 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014), and do “not consider issues raised for the first time on appeal, absent exceptional circumstances,” *Garey v. James S. Farrin, P.C.*, 35 F.4th 917, 928 (4th Cir. 2022) (internal quotation marks omitted). But, “[b]ecause mootness implicates our Article III jurisdiction, we have an obligation to address it sua sponte.” *Wild Va. v. Council on Env’tl. Quality*, 56 F.4th 281, 292 (4th Cir. 2022). Accordingly, because Sirleaf has been released from prison, we dismiss the appeal as moot as to his claims for injunctive and declaratory relief. *See Firewalker-Fields v. Lee*, 58 F.4th 104, 113-14 (4th Cir. 2023); *Rendelman v. Rouse*, 569 F.3d 182, 186-87, 189 (4th Cir. 2009). As for his remaining claims for damages, we have reviewed the record and Sirleaf’s informal brief, and we find no reversible error. We therefore affirm the district court’s order as to those claims. *See Sirleaf v. Clarke*, No. 3:18-cv-00311-MHL-EWH (E.D. Va. Mar. 9, 2021). 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.

*DISMISSED IN PART,
AFFIRMED IN PART*