

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 11-2296**

---

DANE DESOUZA; VELESKA DESOUZA,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

FIRST MOUNT VERNON ILA; FSB; JOHN DOE 1; JOHN DOE 2; JANE  
DOE 1; JANE DOE 2,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

**No. 12-1248**

---

DANE DESOUZA; VELESKA DESOUZA,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

FIRST MOUNT VERNON ILA; FSB; JOHN DOE 1; JOHN DOE 2; JANE  
DOE 1; JANE DOE 2,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Anthony J. Trenga,  
District Judge. (1:11-cv-00845-AJT-TRJ)

---

Submitted: April 30, 2012

Decided: May 25, 2012

---

Before NIEMEYER and KING, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dane Desouza, Veleska Desouza, Appellants Pro Se. James Michael  
Towarnicky, JAMES M. TOWARNICKY, PLLC, Fairfax, Virginia, for  
Appellee First Mount Vernon ILA.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Dane and Veleska Desouza appeal the district court's order dismissing their civil action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) (No. 11-2296), and the order granting the motion for reconsideration filed by First Mount Vernon ILA ("FMV") and revoking leave to appeal the Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal in forma pauperis ("IFP") (No. 12-1248). The Desouzas provide no argument in their informal briefs addressing the district court's dispositive holding that their complaint failed to state a claim. Because we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief, see 4th Cir. R. 34(b), the Desouzas have forfeited appellate review of the district court's dismissal order.

Turning to the appeal of the court's order granting reconsideration and revoking IFP status, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. The district court's certification that the appeal of the dismissal order is taken in bad faith controls in the absence of a showing that the district court itself made the determination in bad faith. See Maloney v. E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co., 396 F.2d 939, 940 (D.C. Cir. 1967). Because the Desouzas have failed to demonstrate on appeal that the certification itself was taken in bad faith, we conclude the certification is controlling.

Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed IFP and dismiss the appeals for the reasons stated by the district court. Desouza v. First Mount Vernon ILA, No. 1:11-cv-00845-AJT-TRJ (E.D. Va. Oct. 21, 2011; filed Feb. 1, 2012, and entered Feb. 2, 2012). We deny as moot FMV's motion to dismiss and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED