

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-6306**

---

KENNETH KENNEDY SHANNON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

C. MICHAEL LAIRD; BRANDAN MCSHEEHY, Special Agent Drug Enforcement Agency (“DEA”); DAVID LESLIE, T.F.O.; CHRIS OKSALA, Group Supervisor, D.E.A.; SEAN MCMICKING, Special Agent D.E.A.; JAMES DUFFY, Special Agent D.E.A.; JAKE GRILL, City of Charleston Police Dept. T.F.O.; REARNY VANN, Dorchester County Sheriff’s Office T.F.O.; JONATHAN HOFF, City of Charleston Police Dept. T.F.O.; ROD RAPE, Special Agent D.E.A.; CHAUNCY SOLOMON, T.F.O.,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (2:22-cv-04318-DCN)

---

Submitted: October 31, 2023

Decided: December 8, 2023

---

Before AGEE, THACKER, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kenneth Kennedy Shannon, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth Kennedy Shannon appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Shannon's civil rights complaint. Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Shannon's informal brief, *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."), we find no reversible error.\* Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order. *Shannon v. Laird*, No. 2:22-cv-04318-DCN (D.S.C. Feb. 28, 2023; Mar. 9, 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*

---

\* To the extent Shannon challenges on appeal the characterization of his claims, he waived appellate review by failing to object to this aspect of the magistrate judge's recommendation after being warned of the consequences of failing to file specific objections. *See Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 846-47 (4th Cir. 1985).