

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7506**

---

ZERELL MCCLURKIN,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BILL BYER, Commissioner SCDC; WARDEN LARRY CARLEDGE;  
SERGEANT LAWLESS; SERGEANT COTTER,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Charleston. Richard M. Gergel, District  
Judge. (2:13-cv-01507-RMG)

---

Submitted: February 20, 2014                      Decided: February 25, 2014

---

Before DUNCAN, DIAZ, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Zerell McClurkin, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Zerell McClurkin appeals the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2006) complaint. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, with respect to the issues raised on appeal, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court.\* McClurkin v. Byer, No. 2:13-cv-01507-RMG (D.S.C. July 15, 2013). 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

---

\* McClurkin failed to pursue nearly all issues raised below and instead focused on the district court's and magistrate judge's finding that he should seek a remedy under the South Carolina Tort Claims Act. Therefore, the issues not pursued on appeal are waived. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (directing appealing parties to present specific arguments in an informal brief and stating that this court's review is limited to the issues raised in the informal brief). See also Wahi v. Charleston Area Med. Ctr., Inc., 562 F.3d 599, 607 (4th Cir. 2009) (limiting appellate review to arguments raised in the brief in accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A)); Williams v. Giant Food Inc., 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004) (noting that appellate assertions not supported by argument are deemed abandoned).