

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7687

SIMON ALLEN, JR.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

BRYAN LOUIS,

Defendant - Appellee,

and

GREENWOOD COUNTY SHERIFFS DEPARTMENT; GREENWOOD SOLICITOR,
Office; B. WARE; N. FUTCH; R. COKER; TONY DAVIS; LONNIE
SMITH; RONNIE POWELL; C. RAYAN JOHNSON; WALTER RUTLEDGE;
BROOKS; WILLIAM KAY; DAVID M. STUMBO,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Anderson. Richard Mark Gergel, District
Judge. (8:15-cv-00363-RMG)

Submitted: February 25, 2016

Decided: March 1, 2016

Before SHEDD and HARRIS, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior
Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Simon Allen, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. Carly Marie Harter, Russell
W. Harter, Jr., CHAPMAN, HARTER & HARTER, PA, Greenville, South

Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Simon Allen, Jr., appeals the district court's order accepting the magistrate judge's recommendation to deny Allen's motion for a declaratory judgment and injunctive relief and grant Louis summary judgment on Allen's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (2012) claim against Louis.* Allen's failure to challenge on appeal the district court's dispositive holdings amounts to a waiver of appellate review of those holdings. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b) ("The Court will limit its review to the issues raised in the informal brief."); United States v. Al-Hamdi, 356 F.3d 564, 571 n.8 (4th Cir. 2004) ("It is a well settled rule that contentions not raised in the argument section of the opening brief are abandoned."). Because we find no reversible error by the district court, we affirm the district court's judgment. Allen v. Louis, No. 8:15-cv-00363-RMG (D.S.C. Oct. 16, 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

* The district court previously dismissed, without prejudice, Allen's claims against the remaining Defendants. Allen does not challenge this prior order on appeal.