

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-2459

JUDITH JONES,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS, school administrators,
resource teachers and its employees, human resources,
employment & retirement service center director; JERRY
WEAST, Superintendent born Joshua Starr; LARRY BOWERS,
Superintendent; SUSAN DEGRABA; RICHARD JOHNSTON; MONTGOMERY
COUNTY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION; DOUG PROUTY, President and
MCEA representatives & its employees,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Paul W. Grimm, District Judge. (8:14-
cv-04042-PWG)

Submitted: March 17, 2016

Decided: March 21, 2016

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Judith Jones, Appellant Pro Se. Silvia Carolina Kinch, OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY, Rockville, Maryland; Christopher Mark Feldenzer, SEROTTE ROCKMAN & WESTCOTT, PA, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Judith Jones appeals the district court's order granting in part and denying in part* Montgomery County Education Association and Doug Prouty's motion to dismiss Jones' claims against them, and granting the remaining Defendants' motion to dismiss Jones' claims against them. Jones has also filed a motion for a restraining order and a pre-filing injunction. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in Jones' informal brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Jones' informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, Jones has forfeited appellate review of the district court's order. Moreover, Jones' pending motion does not establish that she is entitled to the relief she seeks. Accordingly, we deny Jones' motion for a restraining order and a pre-filing injunction and affirm the district court's order. Jones v. Montgomery Cty. Pub. Sch., No. 8:14-cv-04042-PWG (D. Md. filed Oct. 21, 2015, entered Oct. 22, 2015). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

* The district court's order denied these Defendants' motion to dismiss only to the extent the motion sought a pre-filing injunction against Jones. The district court's order nonetheless dismissed all of Jones' claims against these Defendants.

adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED