

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 14-6444

KENNETH V. AWE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DOCTOR MILLER, ROSP M.D.,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

HAROLD CLARKE, VDOC Director; RANDALL MATHENA, ROSP Warden,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Jackson L. Kiser, Senior
District Judge. (7:13-cv-00143-JLK-RSB)

Submitted: July 22, 2014

Decided: August 4, 2014

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

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kenneth V. Awe, Appellant Pro Se. William Francis Demarest, III,
Mary Moffett Hutcheson Priddy, GOODMAN, ALLEN & FILETTI, PLLC,
Glen Allen, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kenneth Valentine Awe appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of defendant Dr. Miller on Awe's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) claim of deliberate indifference to his medical needs. For the reasons that follow, we affirm.

On appeal, Awe challenges the denial of his requests for copies of his full medical record to support his claim. Insofar as he challenges the district court's denial of injunctive relief in the form of an order directing the Virginia Department of Corrections to provide him with photocopying loans, his argument is foreclosed by our prior opinion affirming the district court's order. Awe v. Miller, 553 F. App'x 307, 307-08 (4th Cir. 2014) (No. 13-7880); see L.J. v. Wilbon, 633 F.3d 297, 308 (4th Cir. 2011) ("The law of the case doctrine posits that when a court decides upon a rule of law, that decision should continue to govern the same issues in subsequent stages of the same case.").

Awe's informal brief appears to challenge the district court's refusal to deny summary judgment pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d), as well as its grant of summary judgment in favor of Miller. Because we have reviewed the record on appeal and find no reversible error, we affirm as to these issues for the reasons stated by the district court. Awe v. Miller, No.

7:13-cv-00143-JLK-RSB (W.D. Va. Mar. 11, 2014). Finally, although Awe seeks review of the district court's orders denying his motions for counsel, we conclude Awe has forfeited appellate review of these orders by failing to assert error in the district court's rulings. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) (limiting appellate review to issues raised in informal brief).

Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment. We deny Awe's motions for assignment of counsel. 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