

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1268

SUZETTE ROBINSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

COMMISSIONER, SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Stephanie A. Gallagher, Magistrate Judge. (1:10-cv-03298-SAG)

Submitted: August 18, 2014

Decided: September 3, 2014

Before WILKINSON, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Suzette Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. Alex Gordon, Assistant United States Attorney, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Suzette Robinson appeals the magistrate judge's order denying relief on her complaint for review of the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income. On appeal and proceeding pro se, Robinson submitted an informal brief pursuant to Fourth Circuit Local Rule 34(b). In her informal brief, Robinson merely lists her conditions, her medications, and her medical and treatment history. She does not present any argument that the magistrate judge committed error by affirming the ALJ's determination. Having provided no argument and merely presenting lists of conditions, medications, and treatments as issues on appeal, we find Robinson's informal brief fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and our local rules. Robinson has, therefore, waived appellate review of the issues she has attempted to raise.

An opening brief must contain the "appellant's contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies." Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(8)(A); see also 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (noting an informal brief shall list "the specific issues and supporting facts and arguments raised on appeal"). If an appellant's opening brief does not comply with these requirements with regard to an issue, he or she waives appellate review of that issue. See, e.g., Eriline Co. S.A. v. Johnson,

440 F.3d 648, 653 n.7 (4th Cir. 2006) (noting single conclusory remark regarding error "is insufficient to raise on appeal any merits-based challenge to the district court's ruling"); Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) ("Failure to comply with the specific dictates of [Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(9)(A)] with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal.").

Because Robinson's brief does not present any argument that the magistrate judge erred and is a mere recitation of conditions, medications, and procedures, her brief does not meet these requirements. We conclude, therefore, Robinson has waived appellate review. Accordingly, the order of the district court is affirmed.

AFFIRMED