

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-1752

DEBRA J. ROACH, a/k/a Debra Jarama Roach,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DR. ROBERT M. GATES, Secretary of Defense,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

DEFENSE FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING SERVICES,

Defendant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. David C. Norton, District Judge. (2:07-cv-00136-DCN; 2:07-cv-01574-DCN)

Submitted: October 30, 2012

Decided: November 7, 2012

Before WILKINSON and WYNN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Debra J. Roach, Appellant Pro Se. Terri Hearn Bailey, Assistant United States Attorney, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Debra Roach appeals from the district court's order adopting the report and recommendation of the magistrate judge and determining that Roach's remaining claims in her employment-related action were both unexhausted and meritless. We have reviewed the record in this case, as well as Roach's brief on appeal, and we find no reversible error in the district court's ruling. Accordingly, we affirm substantially on the reasoning of the district court. See Roach v. Gates, Nos. 2:07-cv-00136-DCN; 2:07-cv-01574-DCN (D.S.C. May 30, 2012). In addition, we note that, on appeal, Roach has not challenged the district court's substantive ruling on the merits of her causes of action.* As such, she has waived any challenge to this decision. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The [c]ourt will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief."); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (issues not raised in opening brief are deemed abandoned). We deny Roach's motion for transcripts. We dispense with oral argument

* Roach did challenge the district court's procedural consideration of the merits, averring that the court erred by examining the merits prior to a hearing and other proceedings. We reject this claim of error.

because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED