

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-1797

YVETT C. RUDOLPH,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

HR SPECIALIST, of Business Management Daily; BUSINESS MANAGEMENT DAILY, d/b/a Capital Information Group Inc., doing business as Capital Information Group Inc.; CAPITAL INFORMATION GROUP INCORPORATED; ALLIE P. ASH, JR., President and Officer Capital Information Group Inc.; PHILLIP ASH, Vice President, Officer, and Director Capital Information Group, Publisher for HR Specialist; STEVEN STURM, Vice President, Officer of Capital Information Group Inc.; PATRICK DI DOMENICO, Editorial Director Business Management Daily; ADAM GOLDSTEIN, Associate Publisher Business Management Daily; WILLIAM H. STURGES, Esquire, Editor of HR Specialist,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District Judge. (1:14-cv-00477-LMB-JFA)

Submitted: December 22, 2014

Decided: January 14, 2015

Before GREGORY, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Yvett C. Rudolph, Appellant Pro Se. John Matthew Baird, Arvind
Jairam, DUANE MORRIS, LLP, Washington, D.C., for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Yvett C. Rudolph appeals the district court's order dismissing her civil action for failure to state a claim. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in Rudolph's informal brief. 4th Cir. R. 34(b); see also United States v. Brooks, 524 F.3d 549, 556 & n.11 (4th Cir. 2008) (deeming claim raised for first time in reply brief abandoned). Insofar as Rudolph challenges the order transferring her case from the United States District Court for the District of Delaware, we lack jurisdiction to review this order. Brock v. Entre Computer Ctrs., Inc., 933 F.2d 1253, 1257 (4th Cir. 1991). We have reviewed the record in light of Rudolph's remaining claims and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we grant leave to proceed in forma pauperis and affirm substantially for the reasons stated by the district court. Rudolph v. HR Specialist, No. 1:14-cv-00477-LMB-JFA (E.D. Va. June 23, 2014). 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