

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-7284

FARLEY L. BERNARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

NURSE HOBBS; VIRGINIA SUE DAWSON,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

GERALD BRANKER; CHAPLAIN SPEARS; CHAPLAIN MONTGOMERY;
ROBERT C. LEWIS; KERRY MASSEY; SGT. BENNETT; HATTIE B.
PIMPONG; CARL E. BATTLE; MRS. SMITH; RENOICE STANCIL;
EDWARD B. THOMAS; DONNIE R. RAYNOR; A. JAMES; R. LEE; NURSE
WATSON; DR. WILLIAMS; MARY S. POLLARD,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever III,
Chief District Judge. (5:10-ct-03164-D)

Submitted: December 27, 2012

Decided: January 16, 2013

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Farley L. Bernard, Appellant Pro Se. Lisa Yvette Harper,
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Farley L. Bernard appeals the district court's January 12, 2012 order denying his motions for reconsideration, to amend his complaint, for a preliminary injunction, and for appointment of counsel and directing Defendants Hobbs and Dawson to file a response to his motion to compel discovery, its May 9, 2012 order denying his motions for reconsideration and leave to amend and granting in part his motion to compel discovery, and its July 18, 2012 order granting Hobbs' and Dawson's summary judgment motion and denying Bernard leave to depose in his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) civil rights action.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Bernard's informal brief does not challenge the district court's denial of his motions for reconsideration, to amend, for a preliminary injunction, and for leave to depose or its rulings directing Hobbs and Dawson to respond to his motion to compel and granting the motion to compel in part, Bernard has forfeited appellate review of those rulings.

With respect to the district court's rulings denying Bernard's motions for appointment of counsel and granting Hobbs' and Dawson's summary judgment motion, we have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. Bernard v. Hobbs,

No. 5:10-ct-03164-D (E.D.N.C. Jan. 12 & July 18, 2012). 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