

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 15-1155**

---

DONALD MORRISON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WAYNE R. MYERS; GEORGE B. CURRIN; STEPHEN A. WEST; DENNIS  
DUFFY; S. KATHERINE BURNETTE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of North Carolina, at Wilmington. W. Earl Britt,  
Senior District Judge. (7:14-cv-00085-BR)

---

Submitted: June 29, 2015

Decided: August 4, 2015

---

Before SHEDD, FLOYD, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Donald Morrison, Appellant Pro Se. Joshua Bryan Royster, OFFICE  
OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Raleigh, North Carolina; David  
Stebbins Coats, John Thomas Crook, BAILEY & DIXON, Raleigh,  
North Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Donald Morrison ("Appellant") appeals the district court's order dismissing his complaint. The district court dismissed Appellant's claims against government officials because these claims were barred under the doctrine of res judicata. On appeal, Appellant does not challenge this finding; instead, Appellant focuses on the merits of his claim against a single individual.

An appellant must present his or her "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). "Failure to comply with the specific dictates of this rule with respect to a particular claim triggers abandonment of that claim on appeal." Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999).

Appellant has not challenged the district court's determination that the doctrine of res judicata bars Appellant's claims. Accordingly, Appellant has abandoned his claim that the district court erred by finding these claims barred. So we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Morrison v. Myers, No. 7:14-cv-00085 (E.D.N.C. Jan. 6, 2015). 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