

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-1483

JULIE GASKINS, Individually and as Personal Representative for the Estate of
Andrew S. Gaskins,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

EK REAL ESTATE FUND I, LLC; EASYKNOCK, INC.; TVC FUNDING III,
LLC,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
George L. Russell, III, District Judge. (1:23-cv-01132-GLR)

Submitted: March 28, 2024

Decided: April 1, 2024

Before KING and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Julie A. Gaskins, Appellant Pro Se. Angela Laughlin Brown, GRAY REED, Dallas, Texas,
for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Julie A. Gaskins appeals the district court’s amended order denying without prejudice her emergency motion for a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction and dismissing her civil complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Gaskins’ informal brief does not challenge or address the district court’s determination that she failed to meet the substantive requirements for a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction and that it otherwise lacked jurisdiction over the complaint due to the binding arbitration agreement. Gaskins therefore has forfeited appellate review of these dispositive rulings. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also 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 amended order denying relief on these grounds.* *Gaskins v. EK Real Est. Fund I, LLC*, No. 1:23-cv-01132-GLR (D. Md. Apr. 28, 2023). 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

* In her informal brief, Gaskins takes issue with the district court’s determination that she failed to meet the procedural requirements under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 for obtaining a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction. Because we affirm the district court’s unchallenged determination that Gaskins failed to meet the substantive requirements for a temporary restraining order or a preliminary injunction, we decline to address this alternate ground cited by the district court for denying relief.