

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1486

LARRY DAVIS,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

WEISER SECURITY SERVICES, INC; NORTH CAROLINA NATIONAL
GUARD; RANDY POWELL; JAMES ROSES; JERRY BOWMAN; GUY
MADERES,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Max O. Cogburn, Jr.,
District Judge. (3:13-cv-00522-MOC-DSC)

Submitted: August 18, 2016

Decided: August 22, 2016

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Larry Davis, Appellant Pro Se. Elizabeth Ruth Dangel, OGLETREE
DEAKINS NASH SMOAK & STEWART, PC, Charlotte, North Carolina;
Vanessa N. Totten, Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North
Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Larry Davis appeals from the district court's judgment in Defendants' favor on Davis' racial harassment and discrimination claims, brought pursuant to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e to 2000e-17 (2012). Davis also challenges the district court's order granting Davis' motion for reconsideration, but reaffirming the dismissal order. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Davis' informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's dispositive rulings, Davis has forfeited appellate review of the district court's orders. See Williams v. Giant Food Inc., 370 F.3d 423, 430 n.4 (4th Cir. 2004); see also Edwards v. City of Goldsboro, 178 F.3d 231, 241 n.6 (4th Cir. 1999) (failure to raise issue in opening brief constitutes abandonment of that issue). Accordingly, we affirm the district court's orders. See Davis v. Weiser Sec. Servs., Inc., No. 3:13-cv-00522-MOC-DSC (W.D.N.C. filed Mar. 1, 2016, entered Mar. 2, 2016; Mar. 31, 2016). 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